



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक  
WEEKLY

सं. 41] नई दिल्ली, अक्टूबर 7—अक्टूबर 13, 2012, शनिवार/आश्विन 15—आश्विन 21, 1934  
No. 41] NEW DELHI, OCTOBER 7—OCTOBER 13, 2012, SATURDAY/ASVINA 15—ASVINA 21, 1934

भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पृथक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके  
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)  
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं  
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय

(पेंशन और पेंशनभोगी कल्याण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3091.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परंतुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए साधारण भविष्य निधि (केन्द्रीय सेवा) नियम, 1960 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:-

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम साधारण भविष्य निधि (केन्द्रीय सेवा) संशोधन नियम, 2012 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. साधारण भविष्य निधि (केन्द्रीय सेवा) नियम, 1960 में, पांचवीं अनुसूची के पैरा 2 में, परंतुक से पूर्व विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात्:-

“ भारतीय वनस्पति विज्ञान सर्वेक्षण और भारतीय प्राणी-विज्ञान सर्वेक्षण के समूह ‘क’ अधिकारियों (स्वयं भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक के सिवाय), समूह ‘ख’ और समूह ‘ग’ कर्मचारिवृंद की बाबत निम्नलिखित अधिकारियों द्वारा नियम 12 के उप नियम (2) के अधीन अग्रिम मंजूर किया जा सकेगा, अर्थात्:-

भारतीय वनस्पति विज्ञान सर्वेक्षण:

1. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), पूर्वी क्षेत्रीय केन्द्र, शिलांग।
2. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), उत्तरी क्षेत्रीय केन्द्र, देहरादून।
3. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), दक्षिणी क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, कोयंबटूर।
4. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), केन्द्रीय क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, इलाहाबाद।
5. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), सिक्किम हिमालयी क्षेत्रीय सर्किल गंगटोक।
6. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), अंडमान और निकोबार क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, पोर्ट ब्लेयर।
7. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, पूना।
8. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक (‘घ’ और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), शुष्क जोन क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, जोधपुर।

9. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), अरुणाचल प्रदेश क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, इटानगर।
10. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), डेक्कन क्षेत्रीय सर्किल, हैदराबाद।
11. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), भारतीय गणतंत्र वनस्पति उद्यान, नोएडा।
12. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), आचार्य जगदीश चंद्र बोस, भारतीय वनस्पति उद्यान, हावड़ा।
13. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), केन्द्रीय राष्ट्रीय उद्भिज्जालय, हावड़ा।
14. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), केन्द्रीय वनस्पति प्रयोगशाला, हावड़ा।
15. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), औद्योगिक प्रभाग, भारतीय संग्रहालय, कोलकाता।
16. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), मुख्यालय कोलकाता।

**भारतीय प्राणी-विज्ञान सर्वेक्षण:**

1. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), उत्तरी क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, देहरादून।
2. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), दक्षिणी क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, मद्रास।
3. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), पूर्वी क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, शिलांग।
4. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), गंगभूमि क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, पटना।
5. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), पश्चिमी क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, पूना।
6. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), मरुस्थल क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, जोधपुर।
7. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), केन्द्रीय क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, जबलपुर।
8. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), समुद्री जैव स्टेशन, मद्रास।
9. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), उच्च उन्नतांश क्षेत्र स्टेशन, सोलन।
10. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), अंडमान और निकोबार क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, पोर्ट ब्लेयर।
11. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), असमुद्री जल जैव क्षेत्रीय स्टेशन, हैदराबाद।
12. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), पश्चिमी घाट क्षेत्र अनुसंधान स्टेशन, कोझीकोड।

13. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), मुहाना जैव स्टेशन, बेरहामपुर।
14. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), अरुणाचल प्रदेश क्षेत्रीय केन्द्र, इटानगर।
15. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), समुद्री मत्स्यालय-सह-क्षेत्रीय केन्द्र, दिघा।
16. भारसाधक वैज्ञानिक ('घ' और उससे ऊपर के स्तर का), सुंदरबन क्षेत्रीय केन्द्र, केनिंग।

[ सं. 13/1/2010-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू (एफ) ]

तृप्ति पी. घोष, निदेशक (पीपी)

**पाद टिप्पण:-**

साधारण भविष्य निधि (केन्द्रीय सेवा) नियम, 1960 का का.आ. सं. 3000 तारीख 1-12-1960 द्वारा प्रकाशित किए गए थे। नियमों का चतुर्थ पुनः मुद्रण (29-2-1988 तक सही किया गया) तब से द्विभाषा प्ररूप में प्रकाशित किया जा चुका है। तत्पश्चात् नियम नीचे उल्लिखित अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा संशोधित किए गए:-

- |                      |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. का.आ.सं. 2002     | तारीख 2-9-1989   |
| 2. का.आ.सं. 710      | तारीख 4-3-1990   |
| 3. का.आ.सं. 3006     | तारीख 17-11-1990 |
| 4. का.आ.सं. 3272     | तारीख 8-12-1990  |
| 5. का.आ.सं. 146      | तारीख 20-3-1993  |
| 6. का.आ.सं. 377      | तारीख 10-2-1996  |
| 7. का.आ.सं. 379      | तारीख 10-2-1996  |
| 8. का.आ.सं. 3228     | तारीख 23-11-1996 |
| 9. का.आ.सं. 826      | तारीख 25-4-1998  |
| 10. का.आ.सं. 2500    | तारीख 5-12-1998  |
| 11. का.आ.सं. 2690    | तारीख 16-9-2003  |
| 12. का.आ.सं. 1485(अ) | तारीख 30-12-2003 |
| 13. का.आ.सं. 3682    | तारीख 15-10-2005 |
| 14. का.आ.सं. 1529    | तारीख 6-6-2009   |
| 15. का.आ.सं. 2689    | तारीख 3-10-2010  |

**MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS**

**(Department of Pension and Pensioners' Welfare)**

New Delhi, the 25th September, 2012

**S.O. 3091.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Amendment Rules, 2012.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, in the Fifth Schedule, in paragraph 2, before the proviso, for the existing entries, the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

“In respect of Group ‘A’ Officers (except Scientist-in-charge himself or herself), Groups ‘B’ and ‘C’ staff of the Botanical Survey of India and Zoological Survey of India, the advance under sub-rule (2) of rule 12 may be sanctioned by the following officers, namely:—

Botanical Survey of India:—

1. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Eastern Regional Centre, Shillong.
2. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Northern Regional Centre, Dehradun.
3. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Southern Regional Circle, Coimbatore.
4. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Central Regional Circle, Allahabad.
5. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Sikkim Himalayan Regional Circle, Gangtok.
6. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Andaman and Nicobar Regional Circle, Port Blair.
7. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Western Regional Circle, Pune.
8. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Arid Zone Regional Circle, Jodhpur.
9. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Arunachal Pradesh Regional Circle, Itanagar.
10. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Deccan Regional Circle, Hyderabad.
11. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Botanic Garden of the Indian Republic, NOIDA.
12. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Acharya Jagadish Chandra Bose Indian Botanic Garden, Howrah.
13. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Central National Herbarium, Howrah.
14. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Central Botanical Laboratory, Howrah.

15. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Industrial Section Indian Museum, Kolkata.

16. Scientist-in charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Headquarter, Kolkata.

*Zoological Survey of India*

1. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Northern Regional Station, Dehradun.
2. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Southern Regional Station, Madras.
3. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Eastern Regional Station, Shillong.
4. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Gangetic Plains Regional Station, Patna.
5. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Western Regional Station, Pune.
6. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Desert Regional Station, Jodhpur.
7. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Central Regional Station, Jabalpur.
8. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Marine Biological Station, Madras.
9. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), High Altitude Field Station, Solan.
10. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Andaman and Nicobar Regional Station, Port Blair.
11. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Fresh Water Biological Regional Station, Hyderabad.
12. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Western Ghats Field Research Station, Kozhikode.
13. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Estuarine Biological Station, Berhampur.
14. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Arunachal Pradesh Regional Centre, Itanagar.
15. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Marine Aquarium-cum-Regional Centre, Digha.
16. Scientist-in-charge (of the level of 'D' and above), Sundarban Regional Centre, Canning.”

[No. 13/1/2010-P&PW(F)]

TRIPTI P. GHOSH, Director (PP)

**Foot note:—**

The General Provident Fund (Central Services) Rules, 1960, were published vide S.O. No. 3000 dated 1-12-1960. The Fourth re-print of the Rules (corrected up to 29-2-1988) have since been published in diglot form. The rules were subsequently amended vide Notifications mentioned below:—

1. S.O. No. 2002	dated 2-9-1989
2. S.O. No. 710	dated 4-3-1990
3. S.O. No. 3006	dated 17-11-1990
4. S.O. No. 3272	dated 8-12-1990
5. S.O. No. 146	dated 20-3-1993
6. S.O. No. 377	dated 10-2-1996
7. S.O. No. 379	dated 10-2-1996
8. S.O. No. 3228	dated 23-11-1996
9. S.O. No. 826	dated 25-4-1998
10. S.O. No. 2500	dated 5-12-1998
11. S.O. No. 2690	dated 16-9-2003
12. S.O. No. 1485(E)	dated 30-12-2003
13. S.O. No. 3682	dated 15-10-2005
14. S.O. No. 1529	dated 6-6-2009
15. S.O. No. 2689	dated 3-10-2010

**वित्त मंत्रालय****(व्यय विभाग)****(प्रशासन अनुभाग)****(महालेखा नियंत्रक का कार्यालय)****नई दिल्ली, 24 सितम्बर, 2012**

**का.आ.3092.**—महालेखा नियंत्रक ने सुश्री सुजाता प्रसाद निदेशक, इन्गैफ को अपीलीय प्राधिकारी के रूप में और श्री अखिलेश झा, संयुक्त निदेशक को केन्द्रीय लोक सूचना अधिकारी के रूप में शासकीय वित्त एवं लेखा संस्थान, वित्त मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के संबंध में सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम, 2005 के प्रयोजनार्थ पदनामित किया है।

सुश्री सुजाता प्रसाद, निदेशक, इन्गैफ और श्री अखिलेश झा, संयुक्त निदेशक, केन्द्रीय लोक सूचना अधिकारी के कार्यालय तथा आवास का पता निम्नवत है:—

सुश्री सुजाता प्रसाद, निदेशक	श्री अखिलेश झा, संयुक्त निदेशक
कार्यालय पता	कार्यालय पता
शासकीय लेखा एवं वित्त संस्थान,	शासकीय लेखा एवं वित्त संस्थान,
वित्त मंत्रालय	वित्त मंत्रालय
ब्लॉक IV, पुराना जेएनयू कैम्पस,	ब्लॉक IV, पुराना जेएनयू कैम्पस,
नई दिल्ली-110067	नई दिल्ली-110067

दूरभाष/फैक्स: 011-26184031

दूरभाष/फैक्स: 011-26166254

ई-मेल: sujataprasad@hotmail.com

ई-मेल: jha\_akhilesh@hotmail.com

आवासीय पता

आवासीय पता

पता: मकान नं. ए-6,

पता: 444, सेक्टर-21ए, फरीदाबाद

टावर II, न्यू मोती बाग, नई दिल्ली-23

हरियाणा

दूरभाष: 011-26114142

दूरभाष: 0129-6525439

[सं. ए-28015/2007/एमएफसीजीए/आरटीआई/प्रशा./63/1380]

सी. महेश्वरन, उप महालेखा नियंत्रक (प्रशा.)

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE****(Department of Expenditure)**

(Administration Section)

**(OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER GENERAL OF ACCOUNTS)**

New Delhi, the 24th September, 2012

**S.O.3092.**—Controller General of Accounts has designated Ms. Sujata Prasad, Director, INGAF, as the Appellate Authority and Shri Akhilesh Jha, Jt. Director, as Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) for the purpose of Right to Information Act, 2005 in respect of Institute of Government Accounts and Finance, M/o Finance, N. Delhi.

The office and residential address of Ms. Sujata Prasad, Director, INGAF and Shri Akhilesh Jha, Jt. Director, CPIO are as under:—

MS. SUJATA PRASAD	SHRI AKHILESH JHA
DIRECTOR	JOINT DIRECTOR
Office Address	Office Address
INGAF,	INGAF,
Ministry of Finance	Ministry of Finance
Block IV, Old JNU Campus,	Block IV, Old JNU Campus,
New Delhi-110067	New Delhi-110067
Tele/Fax: 011-26184031	Tele/Fax: 011-26166254
Email: sujataprasad@hotmail.com	
Email: jha_akhilesh@hotmail.com	
Residential Address	Residential Address
Add: House No. A-6,	Add: 444, Sector-21 A, Faridabad,
Tower II, New	
Moti Bagh, New Delhi-23	Haryana
Ph: 011-26114142	Ph: 0129-6525439

[No.A-28015/2007/MFCGA/RTI/Admn./63/1380]

C. MAHESHWARAN, Dy. Controller General of Accounts (Admn.)

( वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग )

नई दिल्ली, 27 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3093.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, ऋण वसूली अधिकरण, अहमदाबाद (गुजरात) के स्थान को नीचे दी गई सारणी के कॉलम 3 में उल्लिखित स्थान की जगह सारणी के कॉलम 4 में उल्लिखित स्थान में सारणी के कॉलम 5 में वर्णित तारीख से नीचे दिए गए विवरण के अनुसार परिवर्तित करती है:—

क्रम सं०	ऋण वसूली अधिकरण	वह स्थान जहां अधिकरण काम कर रहा है	वह स्थान जहां अधिकरण काम करेगा	नीचे दी गई तारीख से
1	2	3	4	5
1.	ऋण वसूली अधिकरण-I, अहमदाबाद (गुजरात)	पहली मंजिल, डायमंड जुबली हाल, गुजरात विद्यापीठ, आश्रम रोड, अहमदाबाद-380014	दूसरी मंजिल, भिखूभाई चैम्बर्स, 18, गांधी कुंज सोसायटी, दीपक पेट्रोल पंप, एलिसब्रिज के सामने, आश्रम रोड, अहमदाबाद-380006	01-09-2012
2.	ऋण वसूली अधिकरण-II, अहमदाबाद (गुजरात)	पहली मंजिल, डायमंड जुबली हाल, गुजरात विद्यापीठ, आश्रम रोड, अहमदाबाद-380014	दूसरी मंजिल, भिखूभाई चैम्बर्स, 18, गांधी कुंज सोसायटी, दीपक पेट्रोल पंप, एलिसब्रिज के सामने, आश्रम रोड, अहमदाबाद-380006	30-09-2012

[फा.सं. जी-26036/2/2005-डीआरटी]

राजीव शर्मा, अवर सचिव

## (Department of Financial Services)

New Delhi, the 27th September, 2012

S.O. 3093.—The Central Government hereby notifies the changes in the location of Debts Recovery Tribunals, Ahmedabad (Gujarat) from the place mentioned in column 3 to the place mentioned in column 4 in the table and with effect from the date mentioned in Column 5 in the table as detailed below:—

S.No.	Debts Recovery Tribunal	Place where the Tribunal was functioning from	Place at which the Tribunal will function from	With effect from
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Debts Recovery Tribunal-I, Ahmedabad (Gujarat)	1st floor, diamond Jubilee Hall, Gujarat Vidhyapith, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380014	2nd floor, Bhikhubhai Chambers, 18, Gandhi Kunj Society, Opp. Dipak Petrol Pump, Ellisbridge, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380006	01-09-2012
2.	Debts Recovery Tribunal-II, Ahmedabad (Gujarat)	1st floor, diamond Jubilee Hall, Gujarat Vidhyapith, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad-380014	3rd floor, Bhikhubhai Chambers, 18, Gandhi Kunj Society, Opp. Deepak Petrol Pump, Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad-380006	30-07-2012

[F. No. G-26036/2/2005-DRT]  
RAJIV SHARMA, Under Secy.

## (केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

(राजभाषा प्रभाग)

[आयकर निदेशालय (ज.सं., मु.प्र. एवं रा.भा.)]

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3094.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड के संलग्न अनुसूची में उल्लिखित संबद्ध/अधीनस्थ कार्यालयों, जिनके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है:—

[फा.सं. 2300/रा.भा.प्र./2012-13]

अमिताभ कुमार, आयकर निदेशक (ज.सं., मु.प्र. एवं रा.भा.)

## अनुसूची

(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, उत्तर-पश्चिम क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)

क्रम सं.	कार्यालय का नाम
(1)	(2)
1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, चण्डीगढ़
2.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, चण्डीगढ़-1
3.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, चण्डीगढ़-2
4.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, पटियाला
5.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (ऑडिट), चण्डीगढ़
6.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), चण्डीगढ़
7.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (कंप्यू. परि.), चण्डीगढ़
8.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई.टी.ए.टी.), चण्डीगढ़
9.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), चण्डीगढ़
10.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), पटियाला
11.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज-1, चण्डीगढ़
12.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज-2, चण्डीगढ़
13.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज-3, चण्डीगढ़
14.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज-4, चण्डीगढ़
15.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज-5, चण्डीगढ़
16.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज-6, चण्डीगढ़
17.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज, पटियाला
18.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज, मण्डीगोबिन्दगढ़
19.	कार्यालय आयकर रेंज, संगरूर

(1)

(2)

20. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नंगल
  21. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रोपड़
  22. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, राजपुरा
  23. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, सरहिंद
  24. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नाभा
  25. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बरनाला
  26. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, सुनाम
- मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, शिमला क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय
27. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, शिमला
  28. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, शिमला
  29. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), शिमला
  30. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, शिमला रैंज, शिमला
  31. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त (सर्कल), शिमला
  32. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1, शिमला
  33. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2, शिमला
  34. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3, शिमला
  35. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रामपुर
  36. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), शिमला
  37. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), पालमपुर
  38. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), सोलन
  39. कार्यालय आयकर उपनिदेशक (अन्वे.), शिमला
  40. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त कार्यालय, मण्डी
  41. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त (सर्कल), मण्डी
  42. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, मण्डी
  43. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बिलासपुर
  44. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, हमीरपुर
  45. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कुल्लू
  46. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, सुन्दरनगर
  47. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, पालमपुर रेंज
  48. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (सर्कल), पालमपुर
  49. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, डलहौजी
  50. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, धर्मशाला
  51. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नूरपुर



52. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, पालमपुर
53. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ऊना
54. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, सोलन रेंज
55. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त (सर्कल), परवाणू
56. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बददी
57. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नाहन
58. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, परवाणू
59. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, सोलन
60. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, सोलन

**मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, हरियाणा क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**

61. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, पंचकूला
62. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, पंचकूला
63. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, पंचकूला रेंज, पंचकूला
64. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), पंचकूला
65. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, यमुनानगर रेंज, यमुनानगर
66. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, अम्बाला रेंज, अम्बाला  
करनाल प्रभार एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय
67. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, करनाल
68. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त, करनाल रेंज, करनाल
69. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, पानीपत रेंज, पानीपत
70. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, कुरुक्षेत्र रेंज, कुरुक्षेत्र
71. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कैथल रोहतक प्रभार एवं  
अधीनस्थ कार्यालय
72. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, रोहतक
73. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), रोहतक
74. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रोहतक रेंज
75. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, सोनीपत रेंज
76. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेवाड़ी रेंज
77. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी कार्यालय, नारनौल  
हिसार प्रभार एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय
78. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, हिसार
79. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, हिसार रेंज
80. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, सिरसा रेंज
81. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, भिवानी रेंज

82. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कार्यालय, जीन्द
83. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कार्यालय, फतेहाबाद  
फरीदाबाद प्रभार एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय
84. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, फरीदाबाद
85. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), फरीदाबाद
86. कार्यालय फरीदाबाद रेंज-I, फरीदाबाद
87. कार्यालय फरीदाबाद रेंज-II, फरीदाबाद
88. कार्यालय गुडगांव रेंज-I, गुडगांव
89. कार्यालय गुडगांव रेंज-II, गुडगांव

**मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, लुधियाना क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**

90. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, लुधियाना
91. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, लुधियाना-1
92. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, लुधियाना-2
93. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, लुधियाना-3
94. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-1, लुधियाना
95. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-2, लुधियाना
96. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, लुधियाना
97. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, लुधियाना
98. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, लुधियाना
99. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-4, लुधियाना
100. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-5, लुधियाना
101. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-6, लुधियाना
102. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-7, लुधियाना
103. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज, खन्ना
104. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज, मोगा
105. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, मलेरकोटला
106. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, जगरांव  
जालंधर प्रभार एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय
107. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, जालंधर-1
108. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त, रेंज-1, जालंधर
109. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त, रेंज-2, जालंधर
110. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त, रेंज, होशियारपुर
111. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, दसूहा

112. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नवांशहर
113. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, जालंधर-2
114. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, जालंधर
115. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-4, जालंधर
116. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-फगवाड़ा
117. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नकोदर
118. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कपूरथला
- मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, अमृतसर क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**
119. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, अमृतसर
120. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-1 अमृतसर मुख्यालय, अमृतसर
121. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, अमृतसर
122. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, तरनतारन
123. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, अमृतसर
124. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बटाला
125. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, अमृतसर
126. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-2 मुख्यालय, अमृतसर
127. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-4, अमृतसर
128. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-5, अमृतसर
129. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, गुरदासपुर
130. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-6, पठानकोट
131. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, मुख्यालय, बठिन्डा
132. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, बठिन्डा
133. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, मानसा
134. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, बठिन्डा
135. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, अबोहर
136. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, मुक्तसर
137. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, फिरोजपुर
138. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, फरीदकोट
139. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, मुख्यालय जम्मू
140. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), जम्मू
141. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, जम्मू
142. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, जम्मू
143. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, श्रीनगर
144. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), जम्मू
145. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कठुआ
146. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, उधमपुर
147. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), जम्मू
148. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.आर.ओ.), जम्मू
149. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, अनंतनाग
- आयकर महानिदेशालय (अन्वे.), उत्तर-पश्चिम क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**
150. कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वे.), चण्डीगढ़
151. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), चण्डीगढ़
152. कार्यालय आयकर अपर निदेशक (अन्वे.), फरीदाबाद
153. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), हिसार
154. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), पानीपत
155. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), शिमला
156. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), अंबाला
157. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), गुड़गांव
158. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), लुधियाना
159. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त निदेशक (अन्वे.), जालंधर
160. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त निदेशक (अन्वे.), अमृतसर
161. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), बठिण्डा
162. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), पटियाला
163. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त निदेशक (अन्वे.), श्रीनगर
164. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक (अन्वे.), जम्मू
165. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), लुधियाना
166. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), रेंज लुधियाना
167. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), पटियाला
168. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय रेंज), जालन्धर
169. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त (केन्द्रीय सर्कल), अमृतसर
170. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त (केन्द्रीय सर्कल), जम्मू
171. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), गुड़गांव
172. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) रेंज, चण्डीगढ़
173. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय सर्कल), करनाल
174. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय सर्कल), फरीदाबाद



(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, जयपुर क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)			
क्र.सं.	कार्यालय का नाम		
1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, जयपुर	31.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 7, जयपुर
2.	कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वेषण), जयपुर	32.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - सीकर
3.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-प्रथम, जयपुर	33.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - झुंझुनू
4.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील-प्रथम), जयपुर	34.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - भरतपुर
5.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - द्वितीय, जयपुर	35.	कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (कम्प्यू प्रचालन), जयपुर/जोधपुर
6.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील - द्वितीय), जयपुर	36.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (अंकक्षण), जयपुर
7.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - तृतीय, जयपुर	37.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (टी०डी०एस०), जयपुर
8.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील-तृतीय), जयपुर	38.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (के०सू०शा०), जयपुर/जोधपुर
9.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (टी०डी०एस०), जयपुर	39.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे०), जयपुर/जोधपुर
10.	कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (के०सू०शा०), जयपुर	40.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (अन्तर्रा, कराधान), जयपुर
11.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), जयपुर	41.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (केंद्रीय), जयपुर
12.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त केंद्रीय - (अपील), जयपुर	42.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 1, अलवर
13.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (कम्प्यू प्रचालन), जयपुर	43.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज -2, अलवर
14.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अंकक्षण), जयपुर	44.	कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (आई०टी०ए०टी०), जयपुर
15.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई०टी०ए०टी०-प्रथम), जयपुर	45.	कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (आई०टी०ए०टी०), जोधपुर
16.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई०टी०ए०टी०-द्वितीय), जयपुर	46.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (एम०एस०टी०यू०), जयपुर
17.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई०टी०ए०टी०), जोधपुर	(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, भोपाल क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)	
18.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अलवर	क्रम सं.	कार्यालय का नाम
19.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), अलवर	1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, भोपाल
20.	कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वेषण), जयपुर	2.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, छत्तीसगढ़, अंचल, रायपुर
21.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (मुख्या प्रशा०), जयपुर	3.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, भोपाल
22.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (समन्वय), जयपुर	4.	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, भोपाल
23.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (तकनीकी), जयपुर	5.	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र -2, भोपाल
24.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (सतर्कता), जयपुर	6.	कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र -3, भोपाल
25.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 1, जयपुर	7.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड -1 एवं 2, इटारसी
26.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 2, जयपुर	8.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बैतूल
27.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 3, जयपुर	9.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, विदिशा
28.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 4, जयपुर	10.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ग्वालियर
29.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 5, जयपुर	11.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, शिवपुरी
30.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त रेंज - 6, जयपुर	12.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, गुना
		13.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, छतरपुर

14. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (टी०डी०एस०), भोपाल
15. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा), भोपाल
16. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (कम्प्यूटर परिचालन), भोपाल
17. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील-1), भोपाल
18. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील-2), भोपाल
19. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, इन्दौर
20. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त -1, इन्दौर
21. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त -2, इन्दौर
22. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, उज्जैन
23. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील-1), इंदौर
24. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील -2), इंदौर
25. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त अपील, उज्जैन
26. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण), इंदौर
27. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वेषण), इंदौर
28. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, खंडवा
29. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रतलाम
30. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, धार
31. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, मंदसौर
32. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, नीमच
33. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, देवास
34. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, शाजापुर
35. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, खरगौन
36. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बुरहानपुर
37. कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वे०), भोपाल
38. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक, (अन्वे०), भोपाल
39. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (आसूचना), भोपाल
40. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), भोपाल
41. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), इंदौर
42. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), रायपुर
43. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), जबलपुर
44. कार्यालय उप/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), ग्वालियर

(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, लखनऊ क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)

क्रम सं.	कार्यालय का नाम
1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, लखनऊ
2.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त -1, लखनऊ

3. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-2, लखनऊ
4. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), लखनऊ
5. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (ऑडिट), लखनऊ
6. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, (कम्प्यूटर प्रचालन), लखनऊ
7. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण), लखनऊ
8. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, फैजाबाद
9. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) - 1, लखनऊ
10. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) - 2, लखनऊ
11. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) - 3, लखनऊ
12. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज -1, लखनऊ
13. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज -2, लखनऊ
14. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज -3, लखनऊ
15. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज -4, लखनऊ
16. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज -5, लखनऊ
17. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज -6, लखनऊ
18. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, फैजाबाद
19. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, सुल्तानपुर
20. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, गोण्डा
21. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रेंज - 1, लखनऊ
22. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी - 1(1), लखनऊ
23. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी - 1(2), लखनऊ
24. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी - 1(3), लखनऊ
25. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी - 1(4), लखनऊ
26. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज -1, लखनऊ
27. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रेंज -2, लखनऊ
28. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -2(1), लखनऊ
29. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -2(2), लखनऊ
30. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -2(3), लखनऊ
31. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -2(4), उन्नाव
32. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी -2, लखनऊ
33. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रेंज -3, लखनऊ
34. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रेंज -3(1), लखनऊ

35. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रैंज -3(2), लखनऊ
36. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रैंज -3(3), लखनऊ
37. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रैंज -3(4), लखनऊ
38. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी रैंज -3, लखनऊ
39. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रैंज -4, लखनऊ
40. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -4(1), लखनऊ
41. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -4(2), लखनऊ
42. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -4(3), लखनऊ
43. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -4(4), लखनऊ
44. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी -4, लखनऊ
45. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, रैंज -5, लखनऊ
46. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -5(1), लखनऊ
47. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -5(2), लखनऊ
48. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी -5(3), लखनऊ
49. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बाराबंकी
50. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी -5, लखनऊ
51. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रैंज-6, लखनऊ
52. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रैंज-6(1), लखनऊ
53. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रैंज-6(2), लखनऊ
54. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रैंज-6(3), लखनऊ
55. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, रैंज-6(4), लखनऊ
56. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -6, लखनऊ
57. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, -1, फैजाबाद
58. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, -2, फैजाबाद
59. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, -3, फैजाबाद
60. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, फैजाबाद
61. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, जौनपुर
62. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, सुल्तानपुर
63. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, -1, सुल्तानपुर
64. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, -2, सुल्तानपुर
65. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, सुल्तानपुर
66. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रायबरेली
67. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, प्रतापगढ़

68. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक आयुक्त, गोण्डा
69. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, गोण्डा
70. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, गोण्डा
71. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बस्ती
72. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, -1, बहराईच
73. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, समुचित प्राधिकरण, लखनऊ
74. कार्यालय उप मूल्यांकन अधिकारी, लखनऊ
75. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), लखनऊ
76. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), लखनऊ
77. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टी.डी.एस.) -1, लखनऊ
78. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टी.डी.एस.) -2, लखनऊ
79. आयकर अधिकारी, (टी.डी.एस.), फैजाबाद

**आयकर महानिदेशक, (अन्वेषण), लखनऊ क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**

80. कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक, (अन्वेषण), लखनऊ
81. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई एंड सी आई), लखनऊ
82. कार्यालय आयकर अपर निदेशक (अन्वे.), लखनऊ
83. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त (केंद्रीय वृत्त), लखनऊ
84. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक निदेशक, (अन्वेषण)-1, लखनऊ
85. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक निदेशक, (अन्वेषण)-2, लखनऊ
86. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक निदेशक, (केन्द्रीय)-1, लखनऊ
87. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक निदेशक, (केंद्रीय) -2 लखनऊ
88. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (एअर इन्टेलिजेन्स यूनिट), लखनऊ

**(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, इलाहाबाद क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)**

- | क्रम सं. | कार्यालय का नाम  |
|----------|--|
| 1.       | कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, इलाहाबाद                             |
| 2.       | कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर                   |
| 3.       | कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (वि. प्रतिनिधि), आयकर अपील अधिकरण, इलाहाबाद |
| 4.       | कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी                    |
| 5.       | कार्यालय आयकर अपर निदेशक (जांच), वाराणसी                         |

6. कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), इलाहाबाद
7. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक निदेशक (जांच), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी
8. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/संयुक्त, रैंज-1, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
9. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक आयुक्त, सर्किल-1, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
10. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-1 (1), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
11. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-1 (2), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
12. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-1 (3), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
13. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-1 (4), इलाहाबाद/भदोही/गोरखपुर
14. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रैंज-1, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
15. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/संयुक्त आयुक्त, रैंज-2, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
16. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक आयुक्त, सर्किल-2, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
17. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-2(1) इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
18. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-2(2) इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
19. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-2(3) इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
20. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-2(4) फतेहपुर/बलिया/कुशीनगर
21. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रैंज-2, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
22. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/संयुक्त आयुक्त, रैंज-3, मिरजापुर/वाराणसी/आज़मगढ़
23. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक आयुक्त, सर्किल-3, मिरजापुर/वाराणसी/आज़मगढ़
24. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-3(1), मिरजापुर/वाराणसी/आज़मगढ़
25. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-3(2), मिरजापुर/वाराणसी/आज़मगढ़

26. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-3(3), मिरजापुर/वाराणसी/देवरिया
27. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रैंज-3(4), फतेहपुर/वाराणसी/मऊ
28. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रैंज-3, इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
29. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आंतरिक लेखा परीक्षा), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
30. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आ. एवं आप. अन्वे.), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
31. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टी.डी.एस.) इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर
32. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/संयुक्त आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय वृत्त), वाराणसी
33. कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहायक आयुक्त (कें. वृत्त), इलाहाबाद/वाराणसी/गोरखपुर

(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, पटना क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)

क्रम सं.	कार्यालय का नाम
1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, (स.नि.प्रा.), पटना
2.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-II, पटना
3.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, रांची
4.	कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वेषण), पटना
5.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-I, पटना
6.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), पटना
7.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (लेखा परीक्षा एवं कंप्यूटर प्रचालन), पटना
8.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील-I), पटना
9.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, भागलपुर
10.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, धनबाद
11.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), धनबाद
12.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-II, पटना
13.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई.टी.ए.टी.), पटना
14.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, मुजफ्फरपुर
15.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), मुजफ्फरपुर
16.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, रांची
17.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), रांची
18.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आई.टी.ए.टी.), रांची

19. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, जमशेदपुर
20. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील), जमशेदपुर
21. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, हजारीबाग
22. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), पटना
23. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), पटना
24. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, पटना
25. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, पटना
26. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-3, गया
27. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), पटना
28. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-4, पटना
29. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), धनबाद
30. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा), पटना
31. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, (कं.प्र.), पटना
32. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, भागलपुर
33. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, बेगूसराय
34. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-3, पूर्णिया
35. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, धनबाद
36. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, धनबाद
37. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-4, पटना
38. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-5, पटना
39. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-6, पटना
40. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, (आई.टी.ए.टी.), पटना
41. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, मुजफ्फरपुर
42. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, मुजफ्फरपुर
43. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-3, दरभंगा
44. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, रांची
45. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, रांची
46. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-3, रांची
47. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-1, जमशेदपुर
48. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, जमशेदपुर
49. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-2, हजारीबाद
50. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, परिक्षेत्र-3, बोकारो
51. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), पटना
52. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), रांची
53. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (केन्द्रीय परिक्षेत्र)-1, पटना
54. कार्यालय अपर/संयुक्त आयकर निदेशक (केन्द्रीय परिक्षेत्र)-2, रांची
55. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, पटना
56. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, पटना
57. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, गया
58. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (टी.डी.एस.), पटना
59. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (टी.डी.एस.), रांची
60. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (टी.डी.एस.), जमशेदपुर
61. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (टी.डी.एस.), बोकारो
62. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (लेखा परीक्षा), पटना
63. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (पद्धति), पटना
64. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (कं.प्र.), रांची
65. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, भागलपुर
66. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, बेगूसराय
67. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, पूर्णिया
68. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, धनबाद
69. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, धनबाद
70. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, देवघर
71. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-4, पटना
72. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-5, पटना
73. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-6, पटना
74. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, मुजफ्फरपुर

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 75. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, मुजफ्फरपुर         | 102. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-1, पटना                   |
| 76. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, दरभंगा             | 103. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, आरा                 |
| 77. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, रांची              | 104. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, हाजीपुर                      |
| 78. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, रांची              | 105. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), पटना             |
| 79. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, रांची              | 106. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-2, पटना                   |
| 80. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-1, जमशेदपुर           | 107. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, बिहारशरीफ           |
| 81. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, जमशेदपुर           | 108. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, बिहारशरीफ           |
| 82. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, जमशेदपुर           | 109. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, गया                 |
| 83. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-2, हजारीबाद           | 110. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, गया                 |
| 84. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अंचल-3, बोकारो             | 111. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, गया                 |
| 85. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-1, पटना            | 112. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, सासाराम             |
| 86. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-2, पटना            | 113. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी-2, सासाराम                    |
| 87. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), भागलपुर           | 114. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-3, गया                    |
| 88. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), मुजफ्फरपुर        | 115. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), धनबाद            |
| 89. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-1, रांची           | 116. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), परिक्षेत्र रांची |
| 90. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.)-2, रांची           | 117. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), भागलपुर          |
| 91. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), धनबाद             | 118. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), बेगूसराय         |
| 92. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), जमशेदपुर          | 119. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), मुजफ्फरपुर       |
| 93. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल-1, पटना     | 120. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट-1, पटना    |
| 94. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल-2, पटना     | 121. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट-2, पटना    |
| 95. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल-3, पटना     | 122. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट-3, पटना    |
| 96. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल, मुजफ्फरपुर | 123. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट-मुजफ्फरपुर |
| 97. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल-1, रांची    | 124. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट-भागलपुर    |
| 98. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल-2, रांची    | 125. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट- धनबाद     |
| 99. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल-3, रांची    | 126. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट-जमशेदपुर   |
| 100. कार्यालय उप/सहायक आयकर निदेशक, केन्द्रीय अंचल, धनबाद     | 127. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट- हजारीबाग  |
| 101. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (1), पटना                 | 128. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आई.ए.पी.), यूनिट- रांची     |
|   | 129. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 1(1), भागलपुर        |
|   | 130. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2), भागलपुर          |
|   | 131. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3), भागलपुर          |
|   | 132. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड- कटिहार                |
|   | 133. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 बेगूसराय             |
|   | 134. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, बेगूसराय            |



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 135. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-3 बेगूसराय         | 168. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (1), पटना       |
| 136. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 मुंगेर        | 169. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (2), पटना       |
| 137. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 मुंगेर        | 170. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (3), पटना       |
| 138. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, पूर्णिया     | 171. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (4), पटना       |
| 139. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, पूर्णिया     | 172. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-6, पटना              |
| 140. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, पूर्णिया          | 173. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (1), मुजफ्फरपुर |
| 141. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, सहरसा        | 174. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, मुजफ्फरपुर          |
| 142. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, सहरसा        | 175. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, मोतिहारी       |
| 143. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (1), (धनबाद)  | 176. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, मोतिहारी       |
| 144. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (2), (धनबाद)  | 177. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, बेतिया                  |
| 145. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (3), (धनबाद)  | 178. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-2, मुजफ्फरपुर        |
| 146. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (4), (धनबाद)  | 179. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), मुजफ्फरपुर  |
| 147. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, (धनबाद)           | 180. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, मुजफ्फरपुर          |
| 148. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (1), (धनबाद)  | 181. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, छपरा                    |
| 149. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (2), (धनबाद)  | 182. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, सिवान               |
| 150. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (3), (धनबाद)  | 183. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, सीतामढ़ी                |
| 151. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (4), (धनबाद)  | 184. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (1), दरभंगा     |
| 152. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, (धनबाद)  | 185. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (2), दरभंगा     |
| 153. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (1), देवधर    | 186. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-3, दरभंगा            |
| 154. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (2), देवधर    | 187. कार्यालय आयकर-अधिकारी, मधुबनी                  |
| 155. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-3, देवधर           | 188. कार्यालय आयकर-अधिकारी, समस्तीपुर               |
| 156. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (3), गिरिडीह  | 189. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (1), रांची      |
| 157. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (4), साहेबगंज | 190. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (2), रांची      |
| 158. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4 (1), पटना     | 191. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (3), रांची      |
| 159. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4 (2), पटना     | 192. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (4), रांची      |
| 160. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4 (3), पटना     | 193. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-1, रांची             |
| 161. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4 (4), पटना     | 194. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (1), रांची      |
| 162. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-4, पटना            | 195. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (2), रांची      |
| 163. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (1), पटना     | 196. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (3), रांची      |
| 164. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (2), पटना     | 197. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (4), रांची      |
| 165. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (3), पटना     | 198. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (1), रांची      |
| 166. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (4), पटना     | 199. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (3), रांची      |
| 167. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-5, पटना            | 200. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (4), रांची      |

201. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-3, रांची
202. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (1), जमशेदपुर
203. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (2), जमशेदपुर
204. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (3), जमशेदपुर
205. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 (4), जमशेदपुर
206. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (1), जमशेदपुर
207. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (2), जमशेदपुर
208. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (3), जमशेदपुर
209. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (4), जमशेदपुर
210. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (1), जमशेदपुर
211. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (2), जमशेदपुर
212. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (3), जमशेदपुर
213. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (4), जमशेदपुर
214. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (1), हजारीबाग
215. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (2), हजारीबाग
216. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (3), हजारीबाग
217. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (4), हजारीबाग
218. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (5), हजारीबाग
219. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (6), हजारीबाग
220. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (7), हजारीबाग
221. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 (8), हजारीबाग
222. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, हजारीबाग
223. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (1), बोकारो
224. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (2), बोकारो
225. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (3), बोकारो
226. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 (4), बोकारो
227. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-3, बोकारो
228. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय परिक्षेत्र-1, पटना
229. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय परिक्षेत्र-2, रांची

**मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**

1. **मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-1 का कार्यालय**
  1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-1
  2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-4, दिल्ली

3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-5, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-6, दिल्ली
5. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (कम्प्यूटर प्रचालन), दिल्ली
6. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (समझौता आयोग)-1, दिल्ली
7. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (समझौता आयोग)-2, दिल्ली
8. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (सहायता सूत्र), दिल्ली
9. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (लेखा परीक्षा)-I एवं II, दिल्ली
10. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, डी. आर.आई. टी. एस. सी.-I एवं II, दिल्ली

**2. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-2 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-2
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-7, दिल्ली
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-8, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-9, दिल्ली
5. कार्यालय सदस्य, समुचित प्राधिकरण, दिल्ली

**3. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-3 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-3
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (न्यायिक), दिल्ली
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (आई. टी. ए. टी.), दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-10, दिल्ली
5. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-11, दिल्ली
6. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-12, दिल्ली
7. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-30, दिल्ली

**4. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-4 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-4
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-13, दिल्ली
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-15, दिल्ली

**5. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-5 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-5
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-16, दिल्ली
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-17, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-18, दिल्ली

**6. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-6 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-6
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-10
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अपील-19, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अपील-20, दिल्ली
5. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अपील-21, दिल्ली
6. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अपील-25, दिल्ली

**7. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-8 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-7
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-8
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अपील-22, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अपील-23, दिल्ली
5. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (एल. टी. यू.), दिल्ली

**8. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-9 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-9
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-24, दिल्ली

**9. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-11 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-11
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-26, दिल्ली

**10. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-12 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-12
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-13
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-27, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-28, दिल्ली

**11. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-13 का कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-14
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-15
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, दिल्ली-16
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-30, दिल्ली

**12. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, (एल. टी. यू.) का कार्यालय, दिल्ली**

1. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (एल. टी. यू.), दिल्ली

**13. आयकर महानिदेशक (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान) का कार्यालय, दिल्ली**

1. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान)-I एवं II, दिल्ली
2. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (मूल्य अंतरण)-I एवं II, दिल्ली
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (अपील)-29, दिल्ली

**14. आयकर महानिदेशक (छूट) का कार्यालय, दिल्ली**

1. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (छूट), दिल्ली

**15. आयकर महानिदेशक (विधि एवं अनुसंधान) का कार्यालय, दिल्ली**

1. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक-I, (विधि एवं अनुसंधान), दिल्ली
2. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक-II, (विधि एवं अनुसंधान), दिल्ली

**मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), दिल्ली क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय**

1. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), दिल्ली
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-1, दिल्ली
3. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-2, दिल्ली
4. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-3, दिल्ली
5. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-1, दिल्ली
6. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-2, दिल्ली
7. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-3, दिल्ली
8. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-31, दिल्ली
9. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-32, दिल्ली
10. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-33, दिल्ली

**दिल्ली क्षेत्र के अन्य कार्यालय**

1. आयकर महानिदेशालय (प्रशा.), नई दिल्ली
2. आयकर महानिदेशालय (सतर्कता), नई दिल्ली
3. आयकर महानिदेशालय (अन्वेषण), दिल्ली
4. आयकर महानिदेशालय (पद्धति), नई दिल्ली
5. आयकर महानिदेशालय (आसूचना एवं आपराधिक), दिल्ली
6. आयकर निदेशालय (ज. सं. मु. प्र. एवं रा. भा.), नई दिल्ली
7. आयकर निदेशालय (वसूली), नई दिल्ली
8. आयकर निदेशालय (आयकर एवं लेखा परीक्षा), नई दिल्ली

**(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)**

1. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त अहमदाबाद-1
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त अहमदाबाद-1
3. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-1, अहमदाबाद
4. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-1, अहमदाबाद
5. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(1), अहमदाबाद
6. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(2), अहमदाबाद
7. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(3), अहमदाबाद
8. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1(4), अहमदाबाद
9. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी रेंज-1, अहमदाबाद

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 10. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-2, अहमदाबाद           | 43. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-2, अहमदाबाद         |
| 11. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-2, अहमदाबाद       | 44. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-3, अहमदाबाद         |
| 12. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(1), अहमदाबाद     | 45. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-4, अहमदाबाद         |
| 13. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(2), अहमदाबाद     | 46. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस, गांधीनगर           |
| 14. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(3), अहमदाबाद     | 47. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, बड़ौदा      |
| 15. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2(4), अहमदाबाद     | 48. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, बड़ौदा        |
| 16. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी रेंज-2, अहमदाबाद     | 49. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-1, बड़ौदा           |
| 17. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-3, अहमदाबाद           | 50. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-2, बड़ौदा           |
| 18. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-3, अहमदाबाद       | 51. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस, आणंद               |
| 19. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(1), अहमदाबाद     | 52. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस, भरूच               |
| 20. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(2), अहमदाबाद     | 53. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, राजकोट      |
| 21. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(3), अहमदाबाद     | 54. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, राजकोट        |
| 22. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3(4), अहमदाबाद     | 55. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-1, राजकोट           |
| 23. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी रेंज-3, अहमदाबाद     | 56. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-2, राजकोट           |
| 24. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद-2               | 57. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस, जामनगर             |
| 25. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-4, अहमदाबाद           | 58. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस, गांधीधाम           |
| 26. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-4, अहमदाबाद       | 59. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, सूरत        |
| 27. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4(1), अहमदाबाद     | 60. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, सूरत          |
| 28. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4(2), अहमदाबाद     | 61. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-1, सूरत             |
| 29. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4(3), अहमदाबाद     | 62. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-2, सूरत             |
| 30. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4(4), अहमदाबाद     | 63. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-3, सूरत             |
| 31. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी रेंज-4, अहमदाबाद     | 64. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-4, सूरत             |
| 32. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, हिम्मतनगर रेंज       | 65. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस, वलसाड              |
| 33. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, हिम्मतनगर              | 66. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-(कम्प्यूटर ऑपरेशन), अहमदाबाद |
| 34. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-1, हिम्मतनगर       | 67. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, पद्धति, अहमदाबाद        |
| 35. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2, हिम्मतनगर       | 68. कार्यालय उप आयकर आयुक्त, पद्धति-1, अहमदाबाद       |
| 36. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3, हिम्मतनगर       | 69. कार्यालय सहायक निदेशक, पद्धति, अहमदाबाद           |
| 37. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4, मोड़ासा         | 70. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, पद्धति-1, अहमदाबाद         |
| 38. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी रेंज-4, हिम्मतनगर    | 71. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, पद्धति-2, अहमदाबाद         |
| 39. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, अहमदाबाद         | 72. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, पद्धति, बड़ौदा          |
| 40. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, अहमदाबाद | 73. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, पद्धति-1, बड़ौदा           |
| 41. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, टीडीएस, अहमदाबाद   | 74. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, एमएसटीयू, बड़ौदा           |
| 42. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, टीडीएस-1, अहमदाबाद      | 75. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, पद्धति, राजकोट          |

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 76. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, पद्धति, राजकोट                             | 108. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद-3, अहमदाबाद   |
| 77. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, पद्धति, सूरत                                 | 109. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-5, अहमदाबाद         |
| 78. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, पद्धति, सूरत                                    | 110. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त-5, अहमदाबाद           |
| 79. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, ऑडिट, अहमदाबाद                                   | 111. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (1), अहमदाबाद |
| 80. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, ऑडिट, अहमदाबाद                               | 112. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (2), अहमदाबाद |
| 81. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, ऑडिट, अहमदाबाद                             | 113. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5 (3), अहमदाबाद |
| 82. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-1, अहमदाबाद                               | 114. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-5, अहमदाबाद  |
| 83. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-2, अहमदाबाद                               | 115. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-6, अहमदाबाद         |
| 84. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-3, अहमदाबाद                               | 116. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-6, अहमदाबाद    |
| 85. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-4, अहमदाबाद                               | 117. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (1), अहमदाबाद |
| 86. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-5, अहमदाबाद                               | 118. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (2), अहमदाबाद |
| 87. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-6, अहमदाबाद                               | 119. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (3), अहमदाबाद |
| 88. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-7, अहमदाबाद                               | 120. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (4), अहमदाबाद |
| 89. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-मुख्या, 1 अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान, अहमदाबाद | 121. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6 (5), अहमदाबाद |
| 90. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-मुख्या, 2, छूट, अहमदाबाद                  | 122. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-6, अहमदाबाद  |
| 91. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-केंद्रीय-1, अहमदाबाद                      | 123. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-7, अहमदाबाद         |
| 92. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-केंद्रीय-2, अहमदाबाद                      | 124. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-7, अहमदाबाद    |
| 93. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी, गांधीनगर                                 | 125. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7 (1), अहमदाबाद |
| 94. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-1, बड़ौदा                                 | 126. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7 (2), अहमदाबाद |
| 95. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-2, बड़ौदा                                 | 127. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7 (3), अहमदाबाद |
| 96. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-3, बड़ौदा                                 | 128. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7 (4), अहमदाबाद |
| 97. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-4, बड़ौदा                                 | 129. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-7, अहमदाबाद  |
| 98. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-1, राजकोट                                 | 130. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद-4, अहमदाबाद   |
| 99. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-2, राजकोट                                 | 131. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-8, अहमदाबाद         |
| 100. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-3, राजकोट                                | 132. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-8, अहमदाबाद    |
| 101. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-3, जामनगर                                | 133. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8 (1), अहमदाबाद |
| 102. कार्यालय अपर आयकर अधिकारी, ऑडिट, सूरत                                 | 134. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8 (2), अहमदाबाद |
| 103. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-1, सूरत                                  | 135. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8 (3), अहमदाबाद |
| 104. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-2, सूरत                                  | 136. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8 (4), अहमदाबाद |
| 105. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी-3, सूरत                                  | 137. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-8, अहमदाबाद  |
| 106. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आईएपी, वलसाड                                   | 138. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-9, अहमदाबाद         |
| 107. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद-2, अहमदाबाद                      | 139. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-9, अहमदाबाद    |
|  | 140. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-9 (1), अहमदाबाद |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 141. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-9 (2), अहमदाबाद     | 174. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4, सुरेन्द्रनगर  |
| 142. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-9 (3), अहमदाबाद     | 175. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, सुरेन्द्रनगर रेंज  |
| 143. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-9 (4), अहमदाबाद     | 176. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त अहमदाबाद-6, अहमदाबाद     |
| 144. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-9, अहमदाबाद      | 177. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-12, अहमदाबाद         |
| 145. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, पालनपुर रेंज           | 178. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-12, अहमदाबाद      |
| 146. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, पालनपुर                  | 179. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-12(1), अहमदाबाद  |
| 147. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, पालनपुर          | 180. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-12(2), अहमदाबाद  |
| 148. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, पालनपुर          | 181. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-12(3), अहमदाबाद  |
| 149. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, पालनपुर, गुजरात  | 182. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-12(4), अहमदाबाद  |
| 150. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4, पालनपुर          | 183. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज 12, अहमदाबाद  |
| 151. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, पालनपुर रेंज          | 184. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, भावनगर रेंज-1       |
| 152. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, पालनपुर रेंज          | 185. कार्यालय आयकर सर्कल-1, भावनगर                 |
| 153. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद-3, अहमदाबाद | 186. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(1), भावनगर     |
| 154. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त अहमदाबाद-5, अहमदाबाद        | 187. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2), भावनगर     |
| 155. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-10, अहमदाबाद            | 188. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3), भावनगर     |
| 156. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-10, अहमदाबाद       | 189. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(4), भावनगर |
| 157. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-10 (1), अहमदाबाद    | 190. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, रेंज-1, भावनगर         |
| 158. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-10 (2), अहमदाबाद    | 191. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, भावनगर रेंज-2       |
| 159. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-10 (3), अहमदाबाद    | 192. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-2, भावनगर        |
| 160. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-10 (4), अहमदाबाद    | 193. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), भावनगर     |
| 161. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज 10, अहमदाबाद     | 194. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), भावनगर     |
| 162. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-11, अहमदाबाद            | 195. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(3), भावनगर     |
| 163. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-11, अहमदाबाद       | 196. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(4), भावनगर     |
| 164. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-11 (1), अहमदाबाद    | 197. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-2, भावनगर     |
| 165. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-11 (2), अहमदाबाद    | 198. मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, अहमदाबाद-4, अहमदाबाद       |
| 166. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-11 (3), अहमदाबाद    | 199. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त अहमदाबाद-7               |
| 167. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-11 (4), अहमदाबाद    | 200. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-13, अहमदाबाद         |
| 168. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज 11, अहमदाबाद     | 201. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-13, अहमदाबाद     |
| 169. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, सुरेन्द्रनगर           | 202. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-13(1), अहमदाबाद  |
| 170. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल, सुरेन्द्रनगर        | 203. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-13(2), अहमदाबाद  |
| 171. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, सुरेन्द्रनगर     | 204. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-13(3), अहमदाबाद  |
| 172. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, सुरेन्द्रनगर     | 205. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-13(4), अहमदाबाद  |
| 173. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, सुरेन्द्रनगर     | 206. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-13, अहमदाबाद  |



- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 207. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-14, अहमदाबाद         | 240. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, महेसाणा                    |
| 208. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-14, अहमदाबाद     | 241. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4, महेसाणा                    |
| 209. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-14(1), अहमदाबाद  | 242. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-महेसाणा                    |
| 210. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-14(2), अहमदाबाद  | 243. कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वे.), अहमदाबाद                 |
| 211. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-14(3), अहमदाबाद  | 244. कार्यालय आयकर निदे. (अन्वे.), अहमदाबाद                     |
| 212. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-14(4), अहमदाबाद  | 245. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदे. (अन्वे.) यूनिट-1, अहमदाबाद         |
| 213. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-14, अहमदाबाद  | 246. कार्यालय उप आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 1/1, अहमदाबाद     |
| 214. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त-15, अहमदाबाद         | 247. कार्यालय सहायकर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 1/2, अहमदाबाद |
| 215. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल-15 अहमदाबाद      | 248. कार्यालय सहायकर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 1/3, अहमदाबाद |
| 216. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-15(1), अहमदाबाद  | 249. कार्यालय उप आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), भावनगर                   |
| 217. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-15(2), अहमदाबाद  | 250. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), भावनगर                     |
| 218. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-15(3), अहमदाबाद  | 251. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे./एआईयू), अहमदाबाद             |
| 219. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-15(4), अहमदाबाद  | 252. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), यूनिट-1, अहमदाबाद          |
| 220. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-15, अहमदाबाद  | 253. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट-2, अहमदाबाद       |
| 221. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त गांधी नगर, अहमदाबाद      | 254. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 2/1, अहमदाबाद  |
| 222. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त पाटन रेंज            | 255. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), महेसाणा               |
| 223. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल, पाटन            | 256. कार्यालय उप आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), महेसाणा                  |
| 224. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, पाटन          | 257. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), यूनिट-2, अहमदाबाद          |
| 225. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 पाटन           | 258. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), महेसाणा                    |
| 226. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 पाटन, महेसाणा  | 259. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), बड़ौदा                  |
| 227. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4 पाटन, महेसाणा  | 260. कार्यालय उप आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 1, बड़ौदा         |
| 228. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज- पाटन         | 261. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 2, बड़ौदा      |
| 229. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त सर्कल, गांधीनगर रेंज | 262. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), बड़ौदा                     |
| 230. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल, गांधीनगर        | 263. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), भरूच                  |
| 231. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 गांधीनगर       | 264. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), सूरत                        |
| 232. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 गांधीनगर       | 265. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट-1, सूरत           |
| 233. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3 गांधीनगर       | 266. कार्यालय उप आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट- 1, सूरत           |
| 234. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4 गांधीनगर       | 267. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट-3, सूरत         |
| 235. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज- गांधीनगर     | 268. कार्यालय उप आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), वलसाड,                   |
| 236. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, महेसाणा रेंज        |   |
| 237. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त सर्कल, महेसाणा         |   |
| 238. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, महेसाणा       |   |
| 239. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, महेसाणा       |   |

269. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), सूरत
270. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), राजकोट
271. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट-1, राजकोट
272. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट-2, राजकोट
273. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अन्वे.), एवं डीडीओ, राजकोट
274. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), जामनगर
275. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), गांधीधाम
276. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय-1, अहमदाबाद
277. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, अहमदाबाद
278. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त कें. सर्कल-1(1), अहमदाबाद
279. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त कें. सर्कल-1(2), अहमदाबाद
280. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त कें. सर्कल-1(3), अहमदाबाद
281. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय वार्ड-1(4), अहमदाबाद
282. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय रेंज-1, अहमदाबाद
283. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(1), अहमदाबाद
284. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय रेंज, सूरत
285. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-1 सूरत
286. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2, सूरत
287. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-3, सूरत
288. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-4, सूरत
289. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय, सूरत
290. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय-2, अहमदाबाद
291. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, अहमदाबाद
292. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2 (1), अहमदाबाद
293. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2 (3), अहमदाबाद
294. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2 (4), अहमदाबाद
295. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय रेंज-2, अहमदाबाद
296. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी केन्द्रीय वार्ड-2 (1), अहमदाबाद
297. कार्यालय अपर आयकर, केन्द्रीय रेंज, बड़ौदा
298. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त कें. सर्कल-1, बड़ौदा
299. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2, बड़ौदा
300. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी व आयकर अधिकारी केन्द्रीय वार्ड-1, बड़ौदा
301. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2, राजकोट
302. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, कें. सर्कल-2, राजकोट
303. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय वार्ड, राजकोट
304. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, बड़ौदा
305. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, बड़ौदा-1
306. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, बड़ौदा
307. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-1(1), बड़ौदा
308. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-1(2) बड़ौदा
309. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, सर्कल-1(1) बड़ौदा
310. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2) बड़ौदा
311. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3) बड़ौदा
312. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(4) बड़ौदा
313. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-1, बड़ौदा
314. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, बड़ौदा
315. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-2(1), बड़ौदा
316. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-2(2), बड़ौदा
317. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), बड़ौदा
318. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), बड़ौदा
319. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(3), बड़ौदा
320. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(4), बड़ौदा
321. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(5), बड़ौदा
322. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(6), बड़ौदा
323. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-2, बड़ौदा
324. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, बड़ौदा
325. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-3, बड़ौदा
326. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(1), बड़ौदा
327. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(2), बड़ौदा
328. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(3), पेटलाद
329. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(4), पेटलाद
330. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-3, बड़ौदा
331. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, बड़ौदा-2, बड़ौदा
332. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-4, बड़ौदा

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 333. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-4, बड़ौदा                              | 363. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, भरूच (ADDL. CHARGE)      |
| 334. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(1), बड़ौदा                                | 364. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, भरूच             |
| 335. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(2) (अतिरिक्त प्रभार), बड़ौदा              | 365. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, भरूच             |
| 336. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(3) (अतिरिक्त प्रभार), बड़ौदा              | 366. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, भरूच             |
| 337. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(4), बड़ौदा                                | 367. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4, भरूच             |
| 338. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-4, बड़ौदा                                      | 368. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5, भरूच             |
| 339. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, खेड़ा रेंज                                     | 369. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, भरूच                  |
| 340. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, खेड़ा  | 370. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस), भरूच            |
| 341. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, खेड़ा                                    | 371. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (सीआईबी), भरूच            |
| 342. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, खेड़ा                                    | 372. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, पंचमहाल रेंज           |
| 343. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, खेड़ा                                    | 373. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, पंचमहाल सर्कल        |
| 344. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4, खेड़ा                                    | 374. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 गोधरा             |
| 345. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (कर वसूली अधिकारी), नडीआद (अतिरिक्त प्रभार), खेड़ा | 375. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 गोधरा             |
| 346. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, आणंद रेंज (अतिरिक्त प्रभार)                    | 376. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1 दाहोद             |
| 347. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, आणंद सर्कल                                   | 377. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2 दाहोद             |
| 348. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, आणंद                                     | 378. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, (गोधरा)               |
| 349. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, आणंद                                     | 379. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-4, बड़ौदा                   |
| 350. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3, आणंद                                     | 380. कार्यालय संयुक्त/अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-6, बड़ौदा |
| 351. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4, आणंद                                     | 381. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-6, बड़ौदा          |
| 352. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, आणंद  | 382. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(1), बड़ौदा        |
| 353. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टी. डी. एस.), आणंद                               | 383. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(2), बड़ौदा        |
| 354. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-बड़ौदा-3, बड़ौदा                                    | 384. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(3), बड़ौदा        |
| 355. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-5, बड़ौदा                                 | 385. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(4), बड़ौदा        |
| 356. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-5, बड़ौदा                              | 386. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-6, बड़ौदा              |
| 357. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(1), बड़ौदा                                | 387. कार्यालय संयुक्त/अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-7, बड़ौदा |
| 358. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(2), बड़ौदा                                | 388. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-7, बड़ौदा      |
| 359. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(3), बड़ौदा                                | 389. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7(1), बड़ौदा        |
| 360. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(4), बड़ौदा                                | 390. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7(2), बड़ौदा        |
| 361. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-5, बड़ौदा                                      | 391. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7(3), बड़ौदा        |
| 362. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, भरूच रेंज, भरूच                            | 392. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-7(4), बड़ौदा        |
|   | 393. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-7, बड़ौदा              |
|   | 394. कार्यालय संयुक्त/अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-8, बड़ौदा |
|   | 395. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-8, बड़ौदा          |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 396. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8(1), बड़ौदा           | 429. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(4), राजकोट     |
| 397. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8(2), बड़ौदा           | 430. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-3, राजकोट     |
| 398. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-8(3), बड़ौदा            | 431. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-4, राजकोट  |
| 399. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-8(4), बड़ौदा           | 432. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-4, राजकोट   |
| 400. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-8, बड़ौदा                 | 433. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(1), राजकोट     |
| 401. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, राजकोट                  | 434. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(2), राजकोट     |
| 402. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-1, राजकोट                      | 435. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(3), राजकोट     |
| 403. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, राजकोट            | 436. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(4), राजकोट     |
| 404. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-1, राजकोट         | 437. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-4, राजकोट           |
| 405. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(1), राजकोट           | 438. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-3, राजकोट                |
| 406. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2), राजकोट           | 439. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-5, राजकोट  |
| 407. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3), राजकोट           | 440. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर अधिकारी, सर्कल-5, राजकोट  |
| 408. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(4), राजकोट           | 441. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(1), राजकोट     |
| 409. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-1, राजकोट           | 442. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(2), राजकोट     |
| 410. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, (टीडीएस) रेंज, राजकोट | 443. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(3), मोरबी      |
| 411. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, (टीडीएस) रेंज, राजकोट   | 444. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(4), मोरबी      |
| 412. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस)-1, राजकोट           | 445. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-5, राजकोट           |
| 413. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस)-2, राजकोट           | 446. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, जूनागढ़ |
| 414. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस)-3, जामनगर           | 447. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-1, जूनागढ़  |
| 415. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस)-4, गांधीधाम         | 448. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(1), जूनागढ़    |
| 416. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-2, राजकोट                      | 449. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2), जूनागढ़    |
| 417. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, राजकोट            | 450. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3), वेरावल     |
| 418. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-2, राजकोट         | 451. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(4), वेरावल     |
| 419. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), राजकोट           | 452. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-1, जूनागढ़    |
| 420. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), राजकोट           | 453. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, जूनागढ़ |
| 421. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(3), राजकोट           | 454. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-2, जूनागढ़      |
| 422. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(4), राजकोट           | 455. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), जूनागढ़    |
| 423. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-2, राजकोट           | 456. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), जूनागढ़    |
| 424. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, राजकोट        | 457. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(3), अमरेली     |
| 425. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-3, राजकोट         | 458. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(4), अमरेली     |
| 426. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(1), राजकोट           | 459. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-2, जूनागढ़    |
| 427. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(2), राजकोट           | 460. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, जामनगर                  |
| 428. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(3), राजकोट           | 461. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, जामनगर  |

462. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-1, जामनगर
463. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(1), जामनगर
464. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2), जामनगर
465. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3), द्वारका
466. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(4), द्वारका
467. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, रेंज-1, जामनगर
468. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, जामनगर
469. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-2, जामनगर
470. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), जामनगर
471. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), जामनगर
472. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(3), पोरबंदर
473. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(4), पोरबंदर
474. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -1, जामनगर
475. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, जामनगर
476. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-3, जामनगर
477. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(1), जामनगर
478. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(2), जामनगर
479. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(3), जामनगर
480. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(4), जामनगर
481. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -3, जामनगर
482. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, गांधीधाम
483. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, गांधीधाम सर्कल, गांधीधाम
484. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक, (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान) गांधीधाम
485. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान), गांधीधाम
486. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, गांधीधाम
487. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, गांधीधाम
488. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (कर वसूली अधिकारी), गांधीधाम
489. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1, भुज
490. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2, भुज
491. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस), गांधीधाम
492. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, सूरत
493. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-1, सूरत
494. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, सूरत
495. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-1, सूरत
496. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(1), सूरत
497. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(2), सूरत
498. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(3), सूरत
499. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-1(4), सूरत
500. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -1, सूरत
501. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (आयकर), सूरत
502. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (ओएसडी)-I, सूरत
503. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (ओएसडी)-II, सूरत
504. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, सूरत
505. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-2, सूरत
506. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(1), सूरत
507. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(2), सूरत
508. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(3), सूरत
509. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-2(4), सूरत
510. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -2, सूरत
511. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-3, सूरत
512. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल-3, सूरत
513. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(1), सूरत
514. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(2), सूरत
515. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(3), सूरत
516. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-3(4), सूरत
517. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -3, सूरत
518. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-II, सूरत
519. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-4, सूरत
520. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-4, सूरत
521. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(1), सूरत
522. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(2), सूरत
523. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(3), सूरत
524. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-4(4), सूरत
525. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, -4, सूरत

526. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-5, सूरत
527. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-5, सूरत
528. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(1), सूरत
529. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(2), सूरत
530. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(3), सूरत
531. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-5(4), सूरत
532. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी-5, सूरत
533. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज-6, सूरत
534. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल-6, सूरत
535. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(1), सूरत
536. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(2), सूरत
537. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(3), सूरत
538. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड-6(4), सूरत
539. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी - 6, सूरत
540. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, ( ओएसडी ), सूरत
541. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ( आईएपी ) - II, सूरत
542. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - III, सूरत
543. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 7, सूरत
544. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल - 7, सूरत
545. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 7 (1), सूरत
546. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 7 (2), सूरत
547. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 7 (3), सूरत
548. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 7 (4), सूरत
549. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी - , 7, सूरत
550. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 8, सूरत
551. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल - 8, सूरत
552. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 8 (1), सूरत
553. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 8 (2), सूरत
554. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 8 (3), सूरत
555. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 8 (4), सूरत
556. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी - 8, सूरत
557. कार्यालय संयुक्त/अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 9, सूरत
558. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सर्कल - 9, सूरत
559. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 9, (1), सूरत
560. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 9 (2), सूरत
561. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 9, (3), सूरत
562. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 9 (4), सूरत
563. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, वार्ड - 9, सूरत
564. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, वलसाड
565. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, वलसाड
566. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सर्कल - 1, वलसाड
567. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 1, व डीडीओ, वलसाड
568. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 2, वलसाड
569. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 3, वलसाड
570. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 4, वलसाड
571. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी - वलसाड
572. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ( सीआईबी ) वलसाड
573. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड ( आईएपी ) वलसाड
574. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ( टीडीएस ), वलसाड
575. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ( टीडीएस ), वलसाड
576. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, नवसारी
577. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर, आयुक्त, सर्कल - 1, नवसारी
578. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 1, नवसारी
579. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 2, नवसारी
580. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 3, नवसारी
581. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 4, नवसारी
582. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, नवसारी
583. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ( सीआईबी ), नवसारी
584. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, ( अन्वे. ), ( सीआईबी ), नवसारी
585. कार्यालय संयुक्त आयकर आयुक्त, वापी
586. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, वापी
587. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, वार्ड - 1, वापी
588. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-2, वापी
589. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-3, वापी
590. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी, वापी
591. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी वार्ड-4, दमण, वापी
592. कार्यालय संयुक्त/अपर आयुक्त ( ऑडिट ), वापी



593. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आईएपी)- I, वापी
594. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आईएपी)- II, वापी
595. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आईएपी)- III, वापी
596. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आईएपी), वलसाड
597. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान), वापी
598. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक - आसूचना एवं आपराधिक अन्वेषण, अहमदाबाद
599. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक - आई एन्ड सी. आई, अहमदाबाद
600. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक आई. एन्ड सी. आई, अहमदाबाद
601. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई., अहमदाबाद
602. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.—महेसाणा
603. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त,—आई. एन्ड सी. आई., बड़ौदा
604. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-1, बड़ौदा
605. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-2, बड़ौदा
606. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-आणंद
607. कार्यालय अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-भरुच
608. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक,—आई. एन्ड सी. आई., राजकोट
609. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक आई. एन्ड सी. आई., राजकोट
610. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई. - 1, राजकोट
611. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-जामनगर
612. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-भावनगर
613. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-जूनागढ़
614. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-गांधीधाम
615. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक,—आई. एन्ड सी. आई., सूरत
616. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर निदेशक, आई. एन्ड सी. आई., सूरत
617. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.- 1, सूरत
618. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई., - 2, सूरत
619. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-वलसाड
620. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आई. एन्ड सी. आई.-नवसारी
621. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक, आर. टी. आई.-अहमदाबाद
622. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक- आर. टी. आई. अहमदाबाद
623. कार्यालय आयकर उप निदेशक - आर. टी. आई., अहमदाबाद
624. कार्यालय आयकर उप निदेशक - आर.टी.आई.-अहमदाबाद
625. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आर.टी.आई.-1, अहमदाबाद
626. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आर.टी.आई.-2, अहमदाबाद
627. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, आर.टी.आई. 3, अहमदाबाद
628. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी आई.टी.आई.-ओएसडी, अहमदाबाद
629. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी एमएसटीयू, अहमदाबाद
630. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक-आईटी व टीपीओ- 1, अहमदाबाद
631. कार्यालय आयकर उप आयुक्त टीपीओ-2, अहमदाबाद
632. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान, अहमदाबाद
633. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान, अहमदाबाद
634. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी-अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान-1, अहमदाबाद
635. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी-अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान-2, अहमदाबाद
636. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी- अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान-3, अहमदाबाद
637. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी-अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान, बड़ौदा, अहमदाबाद
638. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक-अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान-गांधीधाम
639. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान)-गांधीधाम
640. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान)-सूरत
641. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान)-राजकोट
642. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक-छूट, अहमदाबाद
643. कार्यालय अपर आयकर निदेशक-छूट, अहमदाबाद
644. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक-छूट, अहमदाबाद
645. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी - छूट, अहमदाबाद
646. कार्यालय कर वसूली अधिकारी - छूट, अहमदाबाद
647. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक - छूट, सुनेन्द्रनगर, अहमदाबाद

648. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक - छूट, हिम्मतनगर, अहमदाबाद
649. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक - छूट, पालनपुर, अहमदाबाद
650. कार्यालय आयकर सहायक निदेशक - छूट, भावगनर, अहमदाबाद

(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, मुंबई क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)

क्रम सं.	कार्यालय का नाम
1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-I, मुंबई
2.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-II, मुंबई
3.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-III, मुंबई
4.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-IV, मुंबई
5.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-V, मुंबई
6.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-VI, मुंबई
7.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-VII, मुंबई
8.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-IX, मुंबई
9.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-X, मुंबई
10.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-XI, मुंबई
11.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-XII, मुंबई
12.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-XIII, मुंबई
13.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय-I, मुंबई)
14.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-II, मुंबई
15.	कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वेषण), मुंबई
16.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (मुख्यालय) प्रशासन, मुंबई
17.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (मुख्यालय) सिस्टम, मुंबई
18.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (मुख्यालय) समन्वय, मुंबई
19.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (मुख्यालय) कार्मिक, मुंबई
20.	कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (मुख्यालय) सतर्कता एवं तकनीकी, मुंबई
21.	कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (मुख्यालय) (अन्वेषण), मुंबई
22.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-1, मुंबई
23.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-2, मुंबई
24.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-3, मुंबई
25.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-4, मुंबई

26. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-5, मुंबई
27. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-6, मुंबई
28. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-7, मुंबई
29. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-8, मुंबई
30. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-9, मुंबई
31. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-10 मुंबई
32. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-11, मुंबई
33. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-12, मुंबई
34. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-13, मुंबई
35. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-14, मुंबई
36. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-15, मुंबई
37. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-16, मुंबई
38. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-17, मुंबई
39. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-18, मुंबई
40. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-19, मुंबई
41. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-20, मुंबई
42. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-21, मुंबई
43. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-22, मुंबई
44. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-23, मुंबई
45. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-24, मुंबई
46. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-25, मुंबई
47. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-26, मुंबई
48. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-28, मुंबई
49. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-29, मुंबई
50. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-टी.डी.एस., मुंबई
51. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वेषण)-I, मुंबई
52. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वेषण)-II, मुंबई
53. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-I, मुंबई
54. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-II, मुंबई
55. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-III, मुंबई
56. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)-IV, मुंबई
57. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (न्यायिक), मुंबई
58. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा)-I, मुंबई
59. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा )-II, मुंबई

- [illegible]

- [illegible]

- [illegible]

240. कार्यालय वरिष्ठ विभागीय प्रतिनिधि (आयकर अपील अधिकरण)–VII, मुंबई
241. कार्यालय वरिष्ठ विभागीय प्रतिनिधि (आयकर अपील अधिकरण)–VIII, मुंबई
242. कार्यालय वरिष्ठ विभागीय प्रतिनिधि (आयकर अपील अधिकरण)–IX, मुंबई
243. कार्यालय वरिष्ठ विभागीय प्रतिनिधि (आयकर अपील अधिकरण)–X, मुंबई
244. कार्यालय वरिष्ठ विभागीय प्रतिनिधि (आयकर अपील अधिकरण)–XI मुंबई
245. कार्यालय उपनिदेशक (राजभाषा)/सहायक निदेशक (राजभाषा), मुंबई

(मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, नागपुर क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)

क्रम सं. कार्यालय का नाम

1. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, नागपुर
2. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - 1 नागपुर
3. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 1, नागपुर
4. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 2, नागपुर
5. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, अकोला रेंज, अकोला
6. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, खामगांव
7. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - II नागपुर
8. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 3 नागपुर
9. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 4 नागपुर
10. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, वर्धा रेंज, वर्धा
11. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, यवतमाल
12. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - III, नागपुर
13. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 5 नागपुर
14. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 6 नागपुर
15. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, अमरावती रेंज, अमरावती
16. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त - IV, नागपुर
17. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 7 नागपुर
18. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, रेंज - 8 नागपुर
19. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त, चंद्रपुर रेंज, चंद्रपुर
20. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, भंडारा
21. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, गोंदिया

22. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केंद्रीय), नागपुर
23. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (केंद्रीय), रेंज-1, नागपुर
24. कार्यालय अपर आयकर आयुक्त (केंद्रीय), रेंज-2, नागपुर
25. कार्यालय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (केंद्रीय), सर्कल, अकोला
26. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)–I, नागपुर
27. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)–II, नागपुर
28. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), नागपुर
29. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा), नागपुर
30. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण), नागपुर
31. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वेषण), नागपुर

राष्ट्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर अकादमी, नागपुर एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय

1. राष्ट्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर अकादमी, नागपुर
2. प्रत्यक्ष कर क्षेत्रीय प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, लखनऊ
3. प्रत्यक्ष कर क्षेत्रीय प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, मुंबई
4. प्रत्यक्ष कर क्षेत्रीय प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, अहमदाबाद
5. प्रत्यक्ष कर क्षेत्रीय प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, चण्डीगढ़
6. प्रत्यक्ष कर क्षेत्रीय प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, कोलकाता

मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त कार्यालय, बेंगलूर एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय)

क्रम सं. कार्यालय का नाम

मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त - I, बेंगलूर का क्षेत्र

1. आयकर आयुक्त-I, बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय
2. आयकर आयुक्त-II, बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय
3. आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय
4. आयकर आयुक्त (ऑडिट), बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय
5. आयकर आयुक्त (सी.पी.सी.), बेंगलूर का कार्यालय
6. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)–II, बेंगलूर का कार्यालय
7. आयकर अपर आयुक्त रेंज 18, बेंगलूर का कार्यालय
8. एम.एस.टी.यू., बेंगलूर

मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त - II, बेंगलूर का क्षेत्र

1. आयकर आयुक्त-III, बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय
2. आयकर आयुक्त-IV, बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय
3. आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)–IV, बेंगलूर का कार्यालय
4. सदस्य (समुचित प्राधिकरण), बेंगलूर का कार्यालय



<b>मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-III, बेंगलूर का क्षेत्र</b>		12.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त रेंज-1, तृशूर
1.	मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त-III, बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय	13.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त रेंज-2, तृशूर
2.	आयकर आयुक्त, मैसूर का मुख्यालय	14.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त पालक्काड रेंज, पालक्काड
3.	आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-1, मैसूर का कार्यालय	15.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, गुरुवायूर
4.	आयकर अपर आयुक्त, रेंज-2, मैसूर का कार्यालय	<b>आयकर आयुक्त, कोषिकोड प्रभार</b>	
5.	आयकर अधिकारी, मडिकेरी का कार्यालय	16.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, कोषिकोड
<b>आयकर महानिदेशालय (अन्वे.) बेंगलूर का क्षेत्र</b>		17.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, रेंज-1, कोषिकोड
1.	आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय	18.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, रेंज-2, कोषिकोड
2.	आयकर अपर आयुक्त, केन्द्रीय रेंज-2, बेंगलूर का कार्यालय	19.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, कण्णूर रेंज, कण्णूर
3.	आयकर अपर निदेशक (अन्वे.), यूनिट-II, बेंगलूर का कार्यालय	20.	कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहा. आयुक्त, तिरूर
<b>अन्य कार्यालय (जिनके मुख्यालय नई दिल्ली एवं नागपुर में हैं)</b>		21.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, कासरगोड
1.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, क्षेत्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर प्रशिक्षण संस्थान, बेंगलूर	<b>आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), कोच्ची प्रभार</b>	
2.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, (एल.टी.यू.), बेंगलूर	22.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), कोच्ची
3.	आयकर निदेशक, (अंतर्राष्ट्रीय कराधान), बेंगलूर का मुख्यालय	23.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), तृशूर
4.	आयकर (ओम्बड्समैन), बेंगलूर	24.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टी.डी.एस.), पालक्काड
5.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर निदेशक (आसूचना) रेंज, बेंगलूर	25.	कार्यालय आयकर संयुक्त आयुक्त (टी.डी.एस.), कोषिकोड
<b>मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, केरल क्षेत्र एवं अधीनस्थ कार्यालय</b>		26.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, (टीडीएस), कण्णूर
<b>क्रम सं० कार्यालय का नाम</b>		27.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त (टीडीएस), तिरुवनंतपुरम
<b>मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, कोच्ची क्षेत्र</b>		28.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टीडीएस), कोल्लम
1.	कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, कोच्ची	29.	कार्यालय आयकर सहा. आयुक्त (टीडीएस), कोट्टयम
<b>आयकर आयुक्त-1, कोच्ची प्रभार</b>		30.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (टीडीएस), आलप्पुषा
2.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-1, कोच्ची	<b>आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा), कोच्ची प्रभार</b>	
3.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, रेंज-1, कोच्ची	31.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (लेखा परीक्षा), कोच्ची
4.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, रेंज-4, कोच्ची	32.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आंतरिक लेखा परीक्षा), तृशूर
<b>आयकर आयुक्त-2, कोच्ची प्रभार</b>		33.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आंतरिक लेखा परीक्षा), कोषिकोड
5.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त-2, कोच्ची	34.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आंतरिक लेखा परीक्षा), तिरुवनंतपुरम
6.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, रेंज-2, कोच्ची	35.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आंतरिक लेखा परीक्षा), कोट्टयम
7.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, रेंज-3, कोच्ची	<b>आयकर आयुक्त (विभागीय प्रतिनिधि), कोच्ची प्रभार</b>	
8.	कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त, आलुवा रेंज, आलुवा	36.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (विभागीय प्रतिनिधि), कोच्ची
9.	कार्यालय आयकर उप/सहा. आयुक्त, मट्टंचेरी	37.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), कोच्ची
10.	कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी, तोडुपुषा	38.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), कोषिकोड
<b>आयकर आयुक्त, तृशूर प्रभार</b>		39.	आयकर अपर आयुक्त (अंत. करा.) एवं (मू. अंत.), कोच्ची
11.	कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त, तृशूर		

40. कार्यालय आयकर सहा. आयुक्त (अंत. करा.), तिरुवनंतपुरम  
मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, तिरुवनंतपुरम क्षेत्र
41. कार्यालय मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त तिरुवनंतपुरम क्षेत्र  
आयकर आयुक्त, तिरुवनंतपुरम प्रभार
42. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त तिरुवनंतपुरम प्रभार
43. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त रेंज-1, तिरुवनंतपुरम
44. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त रेंज-2, तिरुवनंतपुरम
45. कार्यालय आयकर अपर आयुक्त, कोल्लम रेंज, कोल्लम  
आयकर आयुक्त, कोट्टयम प्रभार
46. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त कोट्टयम प्रभार, कोट्टयम
47. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/सं. आयुक्त रेंज, कोट्टयम, कोट्टयम
48. कार्यालय आय. अपर/सं. आयु. आलप्पुषा रेंज, आलप्पुषा
49. कार्यालय आय. अपर/सं. आयु. तिरुवल्ला रेंज, तिरुवल्ला
50. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (अपील), तिरुवनंतपुरम  
आयकर महानिदेशालय (अन्वे.), कोच्ची क्षेत्र
51. कार्यालय आयकर महानिदेशक (अन्वे.), कोच्ची
52. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (अन्वे.), कोच्ची
53. कार्यालय आयकर अपर निदेशक (अन्वे.), कोच्ची
54. कार्यालय आयकर सहा. निदेशक (अन्वे.), तृशूर
55. कार्यालय आयकर सहा. निदेशक (अन्वे.), पालक्काड
56. कार्यालय आयकर सहा. निदेशक (अन्वे.), कोषिकोड
57. कार्यालय आयकर अपर निदेशक (अन्वे.), तिरुवनंतपुरम
58. कार्यालय आयकर उप निदेशक (अन्वे.), कोल्लम
59. कार्यालय आयकर उप निदेशक (अन्वे.), कोट्टयम  
आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), कोच्ची क्षेत्र
60. कार्यालय आयकर आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), कोच्ची
61. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/संयुक्त आयुक्त, सेंट्रल रेंज, कोच्ची
62. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सेंट्रल सर्किल, तृशूर
63. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सेंट्रल सर्किल, कोषिकोड
64. कार्यालय आयकर अपर/संयुक्त आयुक्त, सेंट्रल रेंज, तिरुवनंतपुरम
65. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सेंट्रल सर्किल, कोल्लम
66. कार्यालय आयकर उपायुक्त, सेंट्रल सर्किल, कोट्टयम  
आयकर निदेशालय (आसूचना) कोच्ची क्षेत्र
67. कार्यालय आयकर निदेशक (आसूचना), कोच्ची
68. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आसूचना), तृशूर
69. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आसूचना), कोषिकोड
70. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आसूचना), तिरुवनंतपुरम
71. कार्यालय आयकर अधिकारी (आसूचना), आलप्पुषा
72. कार्यालय आयकर लोकपाल, कोच्ची

**CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES**

(Official Language Division)

[DIRECTORATE OF INCOME TAX (PR, PP &amp; OL)]

New Delhi, the 28th September, 2012

**S.O. 3094.**—In pursuance of Sub-rule 4 of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the Attached/Subordinate offices (as mentioned in the Schedule) of the Central Board of Direct Taxes, whereof more than 80% of the staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[F. No. 2300/O.L.D./2012-13]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director of Income Tax (PR, PP &amp; OL)

**SCHEDULE****Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, N.W.R. Chandigarh Region and Subordinate Offices**

S.No.	Name of the Office
1.	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Chandigarh
2.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Chandigarh -1
3.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Chandigarh. 2
4.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Patiala
5.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Chandigarh
6.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Chandigarh
7.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Computer Operations), Chandigarh
8.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT), Chandigarh
9.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Chandigarh
10.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Patiala
11.	O/o The Income Tax Range-1, Chandigarh
12.	O/o The Income Tax Range-2, Chandigarh
13.	O/o The Income Tax Range-3, Chandigarh
14.	O/o The Income Tax Range-4, Chandigarh
15.	O/o The Income Tax Range-5, Chandigarh
16.	O/o The Income Tax Range-6, Chandigarh
17.	O/o The Income Tax Range, Patiala
18.	O/o The Income Tax Range, Mandi Gobindgarh

19. O/o The Income Tax Range, Sangrur
20. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Nangal
21. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ropar
22. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Rajpura
23. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Sirhind
24. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Nabha
25. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Barnala
26. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Sunam

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Shimla and Subordinate Offices**

27. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Shimla
28. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Shimla
29. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Shimla
30. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Shimla Range, Shimla
31. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle Shimla
32. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Shimla
33. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Shimla
34. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3, Shimla
35. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Rampur
36. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Shimla
37. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Palampur
38. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Solan
39. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Shimla
40. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Mandi
41. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax (Circle), Mandi
42. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Mandi
43. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Bilaspur
44. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Hamirpur
45. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Kullu
46. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Sundernagar
47. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Palampur Range
48. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax (Circle), Palampur
49. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Dalhousie
50. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Dharamshala

51. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Noorpur
52. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Palampur
53. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Una
54. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Solan Range
55. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax (Circle), Parwanoo
56. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Baddi
57. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Nahan
58. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Parwanoo
59. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Solan
60. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Solan

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Haryana Region and Subordinate Offices**

61. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Panchkula
62. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Panchkula
63. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Panchkula Range, Panchkula
64. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Panchkula
65. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Yamunanagar Range, Yamunanagar
66. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Ambala Range, Ambala

**Karnal Charge and Subordinate Offices**

67. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Karnal
68. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Karnal Range, Karnal
69. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Panipat Range, Panipat
70. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Kurukshetra Range, Kurukshetra
71. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Kaithal

**Rohtak Charge and Subordinate Offices**

72. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Rohtak
73. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeals), Rohtak
74. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Rohtak Range
75. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Sonapat Range

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>76. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Rewari Range</p> <p>77. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Narnaul</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Hissar Charge and Subordinate Offices</b></p> <p>78. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Hissar</p> <p>79. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Hissar Range</p> <p>80. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Sirsa Range</p> <p>81. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Bhiwani Range</p> <p>82. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Jind</p> <p>83. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Fatehabad</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Faridabad Charge and Subordinate Offices</b></p> <p>84. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Faridabad</p> <p>85. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals), Faridabad</p> <p>86. O/o The Faridabad Range-1, Faridabad</p> <p>87. O/o The Faridabad Range-2, Faridabad</p> <p>88. O/o The Gurgaon Range-1, Gurgaon</p> <p>89. O/o The Gurgaon Range-2, Gurgaon</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ludhiana Region and Subordinate Offices</b></p> <p>90. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ludhiana</p> <p>91. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ludhiana-1</p> <p>92. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ludhiana-2</p> <p>93. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ludhiana-3</p> <p>94. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeals)-1, Ludhiana</p> <p>95. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeals)-2, Ludhiana</p> <p>96. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Ludhiana</p> <p>97. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Ludhiana</p> <p>98. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Ludhiana</p> <p>99. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Ludhiana</p> <p>100. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-5, Ludhiana</p> | <p>101. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6, Ludhiana</p> <p>102. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-7, Ludhiana</p> <p>103. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-Khanna</p> <p>104. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-Moga</p> <p>105. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Malerkotla</p> <p>106. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Jagraon</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Jalandhar Charge and Subordinate Offices</b></p> <p>107. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Jalandhar -1</p> <p>108. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Jalandhar</p> <p>109. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Jalandhar</p> <p>110. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -Hoshiarpur</p> <p>111. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Dasuha</p> <p>112. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Nawanshahar</p> <p>113. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Jalandhar -2</p> <p>114. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Jalandhar</p> <p>115. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Jalandhar</p> <p>116. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range Phagwara</p> <p>117. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Nakodar</p> <p>118. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Kapurthala</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Amritsar Region and Subordinate Offices</b></p> <p>119. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Amritsar</p> <p>120. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax-1, Amritsar Headquarter, Amritsar</p> <p>121. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Amritsar</p> <p>122. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Tarantaaran</p> <p>123. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Amritsar</p> <p>124. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Batala</p> <p>125. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Amritsar</p> <p>126. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax-2 Headquarter, Amritsar</p> |
|--|--|

127. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Amritsar	154. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Panipat
128. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-5, Amritsar	155. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Shimla
129. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Gurdaspur	156. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Ambala
130. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6, Pathankot	157. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Gurgaon
131. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Headquarter Bathinda	158. O/o The Director of Income tax (Inv.), Ludhiana
132. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Bathinda	159. O/o The Joint Director of Income tax (Inv.), Jalandhar
133. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Mansa	160. O/o The Joint Director of Income tax (Inv.), Amritsar
134. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Bathinda	161. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Bathinda
135. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Abohar	162. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Patiala
136. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Muktsar	163. O/o The Joint Director of Income tax (Inv.), Srinagar
137. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Ferozepur	164. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Jammu
138. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Faridkot	165. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Ludhiana
139. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Headquarter Jammu	166. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Range Ludhiana
140. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) Jammu	167. O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Patiala
141. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Jammu	168. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Range), Jalandhar
142. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Jammu	169. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Circle) Amritsar
143. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Srinagar	170. O/o The Deputy Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Circle), Jammu
144. O/o The Assistant Director of Income Tax (Inv.) Jammu	171. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Gurgaon
145. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Kathua	172. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Range), Chandigarh
146. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Udhampur	173. O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Circle), Karnal
147. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (TDS) Jammu	174. O/o The Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Circle), Faridabad
148. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (TRO) Jammu	
149. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Anantnag	
<b>Directorate General of Income Tax (Inv.), North-West Region, Chandigarh &amp; Subordinate Offices</b>	
150. O/o The Director General of Income tax (Inv.), Chandigarh	<b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Jaipur Region and Subordinate Offices</b>
151. O/o The Director of Income tax (Inv.), Chandigarh	<b>S.No. Name of the Office</b>
152. O/o The Addl. Director of Income tax (Inv.), Faridabad	1. O/o Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Jaipur
153. O/o The Assistant Director of Income tax (Inv.), Hissar	2. O/o Director General of Income Tax (Inv.), Jaipur
	3. O/o Commissioner of Income Tax-I, Jaipur



4.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal-I), Jaipur	32.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-Sikar
5.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax -II, Jaipur	33.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-Jhunjhunu
6.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal-II), Jaipur	34.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-Bharatpur
7.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax -III, Jaipur	35.	O/o Additional/Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, (Computer Operation) Jaipur/Jodhpur
8.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax -(Appeals III), Jaipur	36.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, (Audit), Jaipur
9.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Jaipur	37.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, (TDS), Jaipur
10.	O/o Director of Income Tax (CIB), Jaipur	38.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, CIB Jaipur/Jodhpur
11.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Jaipur	39.	O/o Additional Director of Income Tax, (Investigation), Jaipur/Jodhpur
12.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Central- Appeal), Jaipur	40.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, (International Taxation), Jaipur
13.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Computer Operation), Jaipur	41.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, (Central), Jaipur
14.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Jaipur	42.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Alwar
15.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT-I), Jaipur	43.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Alwar
16.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT-II), Jaipur	44.	O/o Additional/Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, (ITAT), Jaipur
17.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT), Jodhpur	45.	O/o Additional/Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, (ITAT), Jodhpur
18.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax, Alwar	46.	O/o Income Tax Officer (MSTU), Jaipur
19.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Alwar	<b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Lucknow Region and Subordinate Offices</b>	
20.	O/o Director of Income Tax (Investigation), Jaipur	<b>S.No. Name of the office</b>	
21.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax (Hqrs. Admn.), Jaipur	1.	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Lucknow
22.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax (Co-ordination), Jaipur	2.	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax -1. Lucknow
23.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax (Technical), Jaipur	3.	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax -2, Lucknow
24.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax (Vigilance), Jaipur	4.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Lucknow
25.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Jaipur	5.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Lucknow
26.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Jaipur	6.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Computer Operations), Lucknow
27.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Jaipur		
28.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Jaipur		
29.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-5, Jaipur		
30.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6, Jaipur		
31.	O/o Additional Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-7, Jaipur		



- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 7. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Income Tax Appellate Tribunal), Lucknow | 34. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(1) Lucknow    |
| 8. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Faizabad                                | 35. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(2) Lucknow    |
| 9. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -1, Lucknow                     | 36. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(3) Lucknow    |
| 10. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -2, Lucknow                    | 37. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(4) Lucknow    |
| 11. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -3, Lucknow                    | 38. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -Range- 3, Lucknow                |
| 12. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Lucknow.               | 39. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Lucknow    |
| 13. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Lucknow                | 40. O/o The Income Tax Officer -4(1), Lucknow                      |
| 14. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3, Lucknow                | 41. O/o The Income Tax Officer -4(2), Lucknow                      |
| 15. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4, Lucknow                | 42. O/o The Income Tax Officer -4(3), Lucknow                      |
| 16. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -5, Lucknow                | 43. O/o The Income Tax Officer -4(4), Lucknow                      |
| 17. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -6, Lucknow                | 44. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -4, Lucknow                       |
| 18. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Faizabad                         | 45. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-5, Lucknow       |
| 19. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Sultanpur                        | 46. O/o The Income Tax Officer -5(1), Lucknow                      |
| 20. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Gonda                            | 47. O/o The Income Tax Officer -5(2), Lucknow                      |
| 21. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Lucknow                  | 48. O/o The Income Tax Officer -5(3), Lucknow                      |
| 22. O/o The Income Tax Officer -1(1), Lucknow                                  | 49. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Barabanki                          |
| 23. O/o The Income Tax Officer -1 (2), Lucknow                                 | 50. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -5, Lucknow                       |
| 24. O/o The Income Tax Officer -1(3), Lucknow                                  | 51. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6, Lucknow    |
| 25. O/o The Income Tax Officer -1(4), Lucknow                                  | 52. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6(1), Lucknow |
| 26. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -1, Lucknow                            | 53. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6(2), Lucknow |
| 27. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Lucknow                | 54. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6(3), Lucknow |
| 28. O/o The Income Tax Officer -2(1), Lucknow                                  | 55. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6(4), Lucknow |
| 29. O/o The Income Tax Officer -2(2), Lucknow                                  | 56. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -6, Lucknow                       |
| 30. O/o The Income Tax Officer -2(3), Lucknow                                  | 57. O/o The Income Tax Officer -1. Faizabad                        |
| 31. O/o The Income Tax Officer -2(4), Unnao                                    | 58. O/o The Income Tax Officer -2. Faizabad                        |
| 32. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -2, Lucknow                                   | 59. O/o The Income Tax Officer -3. Faizabad                        |
| 33. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3, Lucknow                  | 60. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Faizabad                         |
|  | 61. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Jaunpur                            |
|  | 62. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Sultanpur           |

		<b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Allahabad Region and Subordinate Offices</b>	
		<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Name of the office</b>
		(1)	(2)
63.	O/o The Income Tax Officer -1, Sultanpur		
64.	O/o The Income Tax Officer -2, Sultanpur		
65.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Sultanpur		
66.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Rai Bareili		
67.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Pratapgarh	1.	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Allahabad
68.	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Gonda	2.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
69.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Gonda	3.	O/o Commissioner of Income Tax (Departmental Representative) ITA T, Allahabad
70.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Gonda	4.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Allahabad/Varanasi
71.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Basti	5.	O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Investigation), Varanasi
72.	O/o The Income Tax Officer- 1, Bahraich	6.	O/o The Joint Director of Income Tax (TDS), Allahabad
73.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Appropriate Authority, Lucknow	7.	O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Investigation), Allahabad/Varanasi
74.	O/o The Dy. Valuation Officer, Lucknow	8.	O/o The Addl./Jt. of Income Tax, Range-I, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
75.	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Lucknow	9.	O/o The Dy./Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -1, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
76.	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Lucknow	10.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 1(1), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
77.	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS)-1, Lucknow	11.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 1(2), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
78.	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS)-2, Lucknow	12.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 1(3), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
79.	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Faizabad	13.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 1(4), Allahabad/Bhadohi/Gorakhpur
<b>Director General of Income Tax (Investigation), Region Lucknow and Subordinate Offices</b>		14.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range-I Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
80.	O/o The Director General of Income Tax (Investigation), Lucknow	15.	O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
81.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (I&C.I), Lucknow	16.	O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
82.	O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Lucknow	17.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 2(1), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
83.	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central Circle), Lucknow	18.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 2(2), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
84.	O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Investigation)-1, Lucknow	19.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 2(3), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur
85.	O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Investigation)-2, Lucknow	20.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 2(4), Fatehpur/Ballia/Kushi Nagar
86.	O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Central)-1, Lucknow		
87.	O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Central)-2, Lucknow		
88.	O/o The Income Tax Officer (Air Intelligence Unit), Lucknow		

21. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range-II, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur	10. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Dhanbad
22. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Mirzapur/Varanasi/Azamgarh	11. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal ), Dhanbad
23. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -3, Mirzapur/Varanasi/Azamgarh	12. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax-2, Patna
24. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 3(1), Mirzapur Varanasi/ Azamgarh	13. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT), Patna
25. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 3(2), Mirzapur Varanasi/ Azamgarh	14. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax , Muzaffarpur
26. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 3(3), Mirzapur Varanasi/ Deoriya	15. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Muzaffarpur
27. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Range 3(4), Fatehpur Varanasi/ Mau	16. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ranchi
28. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range- 3, Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur	17. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Ranchi
29. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Internal Audit), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur	18. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT), Ranchi
30. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Intelligence & Criminal Investigation), Allahabad/Varanasi Gorakhpur	19. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Jamshedpur
31. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (TDS), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur	20. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Jamshedpur
32. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (Central Circle), Varanasi	21. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Hazaribagh
33. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (Central Circle), Allahabad/Varanasi/Gorakhpur	22. O/o The Directorate of Income tax (Inv.), Patna
<b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Patna Region and Subordinate Offices</b>	
<b>S.No. Name of the office</b>	23. O/o The Commissioner of Income tax (Central), Patna
1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (CCA), Patna	24. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-I, Patna
2. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax -II, Patna	25. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Patna
3. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ranchi	26. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Gaya
4. O/o The Directorate General of Income Tax (Inv.), Patna	27. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Patna
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax-I, Patna	28. O/o The Addl. /Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Patna
6. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Patna	29. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Dhanbad
7. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit & Comp. Op.), Patna	30. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Patna
8. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal -I), Patna	31. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax (C.O.), Patna
9. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Bhagalpur	32. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Bhagalpur
	33. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Begusarai
	34. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Purnea

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 35. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Dhanbad     | 57. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-3, Gaya          |
| 36. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Dhanbad     | 58. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (TDS), Patna           |
| 37. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-4, Patna       | 59. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (TDS), Ranchi          |
| 38. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-5, Patna       | 60. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (TDS), Jamshedpur       |
| 39. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-6 Patna        | 61. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (TDS), Bokaro           |
| 40. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (ITAT), Patna        | 62. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (Audit), Patna          |
| 41. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Muzaffarpur | 63. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (System), Patna .       |
| 42. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Muzaffarpur | 64. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, (C.O.), Ranchi          |
| 43. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Darbhanga   | 65. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Bhagalpur     |
| 44. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Ranchi      | 66. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-2, Begusarai     |
| 45. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Ranchi      | 67. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-3, Purnea        |
| 46. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Ranchi      | 68. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Dhanbad       |
| 47. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-1, Jamshedpur  | 69. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-2, Dhanbad       |
| 48. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Jamshedpur  | 70. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-3, Deoghar       |
| 49. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Hazaribagh  | 71. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-4, Patna         |
| 50. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-3, Bokaro      | 72. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-5, Patna         |
| 51. O/o The Addl./Jt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Patna             | 73. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-6, Patna        |
| 52. O/o The Addl./Jt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Ranchi            | 74. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Muzaffarpur   |
| 53. O/o The Addl./Jt. Director of Income Tax (Central Range)-1, Patna  | 75. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Muzaffarpur |
| 54. O/o The Addl./Jt. Director of Income Tax (Central Range)-2, Ranchi | 76. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -3, Darbhanga    |
| 55. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Patna     | 77. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-1, Ranchi       |
| 56. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-2, Patna    | 78. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Ranchi       |
|  | 79. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -3, Ranchi       |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 80. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -1, Jamshedpur   | 103. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Arrah         |
| 81. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Jamshedpur   | 104. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Hajipur               |
| 82. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -3, Jamshedpur   | 105. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(2), Patna      |
| 83. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Hazaribagh   | 106. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -2, Patna            |
| 84. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -3, Bokaro       | 107. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Biharsharif   |
| 85. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.)-1, Patna             | 108. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Biharsharif   |
| 86. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.)-2, Patna             | 109. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Gaya          |
| 87. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.), Bhagalpur           | 110. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Gaya          |
| 88. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.), Muzaffarpur         | 111. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3, Gaya          |
| 89. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.)-1, Ranchi            | 112. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Sasaram       |
| 90. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.)-2, Ranchi            | 113. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Sasaram       |
| 91. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.), Dhanbad             | 114. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -3, Gaya             |
| 92. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.), Jamshedpur          | 115. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Dhanbad         |
| 93. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle-1, Patna     | 116. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Ranchi Range    |
| 94. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle-2, Patna     | 117. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Bhagalpur       |
| 95. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle-3, Patna     | 118. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Begusarai       |
| 96. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle, Muzaffarpur | 119. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Muzaffarpur     |
| 97. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle-1, Ranchi    | 120. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-1, Patna    |
| 98. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle-2, Ranchi    | 121. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-2, Patna    |
| 99. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle-3, Ranchi    | 122. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-3, Patna    |
| 100. O/o The Dy./Asstt. Director of Income Tax, Central Circle, Dhanbad    | 123. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-Muzaffarpur |
| 101. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(1), Patna                          | 124. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-Bhagalpur   |
| 102. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-1, Patna                                 | 125. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-Dhanbad     |
|  | 126. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP) -Unit-Jamshedpur |
|  | 127. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit-Hazaribagh  |
|  | 128. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP)-Unit -Ranchi     |
|  | 129. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(1), Bhagalpur  |
|  | 130. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(2), Bhagalpur  |
|  | 131. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(3), Bhagalpur  |
|  | 132. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward, Katihar         |
|  | 133. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Begusarai    |
|  | 134. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Begusarai    |
|  | 135. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-3, Begusarai         |
|  | 136. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Munger        |
|  | 137. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Munger        |
|  | 138. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Purnea        |
|  | 139. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Purnea        |



140. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Purnea	177. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Bettiah
141. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Saharasa	178. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-2, Muzaffarpur
142. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2, Saharasa	179. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(1), Muzaffarpur
143. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(1), Dhanbad	180. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Muzaffarpur
144. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(2), Dhanbad	181. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Chapra
145. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(3), Dhanbad	182. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Siwan
146. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(4), Dhanbad	183. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Sitamarhi
147. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Dhanbad	184. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3( 1), Darbhanga
148. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(1), Dhanbad	185. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(2), Darbhanga
149. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(2), Dhanbad	186. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-3, Darbhanga
150. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(3), Dhanbad	187. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Madhubani
151. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(4), Dhanbad	188. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Samastipur
152. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Ward -2, Dhanbad	189. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Ranchi
153. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(1), Deoghar	190. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Ranchi
154. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(2), Deoghar	191. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Ranchi
155. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-3, Deoghar	192. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Ranchi
156. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(3), Giridih	193. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-1, Ranchi
157. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(4), Sahebganj	194. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(1), Ranchi
158. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-4(1), Patna	195. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(2), Ranchi
159. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(2), Patna	196. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(3), Ranchi
160. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(3), Patna	197. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(4), Ranchi
161. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(4), Patna	198. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(1), Ranchi
162. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-4, Patna	199. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(3), Ranchi
163. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(1), Patna	200. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(4), Ranchi
164. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(2), Patna	201. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-3, Ranchi
165. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(3), Patna	202. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(1), Jamshedpur
166. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(4), Patna	203. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(2), Jamshedpur
167. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-5, Patna	204. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(3), Jamshedpur
168. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(1), Patna	205. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(4), Jamshedpur
169. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(2), Patna	206. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(1), Jamshedpur
170. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(3), Patna	207. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(2), Jamshedpur
171. O/o The Income Tax Officer, ward -6(4), Patna	208. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(3), Jamshedpur
172. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-6, Patna	209. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(4), Jamshedpur
173. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(1), Muzaffarpur	210. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(1), Jamshedpur
174. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Muzaffarpur	211. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(2), Jamshedpur
175. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1, Motihari	212. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(3), Jamshedpur
176. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Motihari	213. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-3(4), Jamshedpur



- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 214. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(1), Hazaribagh      | 15. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Bhopal               |
| 215. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-2(2), Hazaribagh      | 16. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Computer Operation), Bhopal  |
| 216. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Hazaribagh     | 17. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal- 1), Bhopal           |
| 217. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Hazaribagh     | 18. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal- 2), Bhopal           |
| 218. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(5), Hazaribagh     | 19. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Indore                 |
| 219. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(6), Hazaribagh     | 20. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Indore                    |
| 220. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(7), Hazaribagh     | 21. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -2, Indore                    |
| 221. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(8), Hazaribagh     | 22. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ujjain                       |
| 222. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Hazaribagh               | 23. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal- 1), Indore           |
| 223. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(1), Bokaro         | 24. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal -2 ), Indore          |
| 224. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(2), Bokaro         | 25. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Ujjain              |
| 225. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(3), Bokaro         | 26. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT), Indore                |
| 226. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(4), Bokaro         | 27. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Investigation), Indore |
| 227. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-3, Bokaro                 | 28. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Khandwa                |
| 228. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Central Circle-1, Patna  | 29. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Ratlam                 |
| 229. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Central Circle-2, Ranchi | 30. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Dhar                                 |

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Bhopal Region and Subordinate Offices**

- | S.No. | Name of the office  |
|-------|---|
| 1.    | O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Bhopal                    |
| 2.    | O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Chhattisgarh Zone, Raipur |
| 3.    | O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Bhopal                          |
| 4.    | O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Bhopal          |
| 5.    | O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Bhopal          |
| 6.    | O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3, Bhopal          |
| 7.    | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1 and 2, Itarsi                   |
| 8.    | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Betul                                   |
| 9.    | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Vidisha                                 |
| 10.   | O/o The Commissioner of Income, Gwalior                             |
| 11.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Shivpuri                                |
| 12.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Guna                                    |
| 13.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Chhatarpur                              |
| 14.   | O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Bhopal                    |
| 31.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Mandsaur                                |
| 32.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Neemuch                                 |
| 33.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Dewas                                   |
| 34.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Shajapur                                |
| 35.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Khargone                                |
| 36.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Burhanpur                               |
| 37.   | O/o The Directorate General of Income Tax (Inv.), Bhopal            |
| 38.   | O/o The Directorate of Income Tax (Inv.), Bhopal                    |
| 39.   | O/o The Directorate of Income Tax (Intelligence), Bhopal            |
| 40.   | O/o The Addl./Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Bhopal           |
| 41.   | O/o The Addl./Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Indore           |
| 42.   | O/o The Addl./Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Raipur           |
| 43.   | O/o The Addl. /Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Jabalpur        |
| 44.   | O/o The Dy./Joint Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Gwalior            |

**O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi  
Region and Subordinate Offices**

**1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-1**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-1
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-4
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-5
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-6
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Computer Operation), Delhi
6. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (SC)-1, Delhi
7. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (SC)-2, Delhi
8. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Helpline), Delhi
9. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Audit) I and II, Delhi
10. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, D.R.-ITSC- I and II, Delhi

**2. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -2**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -2
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-7
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-8
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-9
5. O/o The Member, Appropriate Authority, Delhi

**3. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -3**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -3
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Judicial), Delhi
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (ITAT), Delhi
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-10, Delhi
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-11, Delhi
6. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-12, Delhi
7. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) -30, Delhi

**4. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -4**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -4
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) -13, Delhi
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) -15, Delhi

**5. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -5**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -5
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-16, Delhi
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-17, Delhi
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-18, Delhi

**6. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-6**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-6
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-10
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-19, Delhi
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-20, Delhi
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-21, Delhi
6. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-25, Delhi

**7. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-8**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-8
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-8
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-22, Delhi
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-23, Delhi
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (LTU), Delhi

**8. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-9**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-9
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-24

**9. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-11**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -11
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) -26, Delhi

**10. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-12**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-12
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -13
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-27, Delhi
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal)-28, Delhi

**11. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi-13**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -14
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -15
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Delhi -16
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (Appeal) -30, Delhi

**12. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (LTU), Delhi**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (LTU), Delhi

**13. O/o The Director General of Income Tax (International Taxation), Delhi**

1. O/o The Director of Income Tax (International Taxation)-I & II, Delhi
2. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Transfer Pricing) -I and II, Delhi
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal)- 29, Delhi

**14. O/o The Director General of Income Tax (Exemption), Delhi**

1. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Exemption), Delhi

**15. O/o The Director General of Income Tax ( Legal & Research ), Delhi**

1. O/o The Director of Income Tax -I (L & R), Delhi
2. O/o The Director of Income Tax -II (L & R), Delhi

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax(Central), Delhi Region and Subordinate Offices**

1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Delhi
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -1, Delhi
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -2, Delhi
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -3, Delhi
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -1, Delhi
6. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -2, Delhi
7. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -3, Delhi
8. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -31, Delhi
9. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -32, Delhi
10. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -33, Delhi

**Other Offices of Delhi Region**

1. Directorate General of Income Tax (Admn.), New Delhi
2. Directorate General of Income Tax (Vigilance), New Delhi
3. Directorate General of Income Tax (Investigation), Delhi
4. Directorate General of Income Tax (System), New Delhi
5. Directorate General of Income Tax (Intelligence & Criminal), Delhi
6. Directorate of Income Tax (PR,PP & OL), New Delhi
7. Directorate of Income Tax (Recovery), New Delhi
8. Directorate of Income Tax (IT & Audit), New Delhi

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad Region and Subordinate Offices**

1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-1
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax Ahmedabad-1
3. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Ahmedabad
4. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1, Ahmedabad
5. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Ahmedabad
6. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Ahmedabad
7. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Ahmedabad
8. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Ahmedabad
9. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -1, Ahmedabad
10. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -2, Ahmedabad
11. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -2, Ahmedabad
12. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Ahmedabad
13. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Ahmedabad
14. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Ahmedabad
15. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Ahmedabad
16. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range-2, Ahmedabad
17. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax-3, Ahmedabad

18. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -3, Ahmedabad
19. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(1), Ahmedabad
20. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(2), Ahmedabad
21. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(3), Ahmedabad
22. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(4), Ahmedabad
23. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -3, Ahmedabad
24. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-2
25. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -4, Ahmedabad
26. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -4, Ahmedabad
27. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(1), Ahmedabad
28. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(2), Ahmedabad
29. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(3), Ahmedabad
30. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(4), Ahmedabad
31. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -4, Ahmedabad
32. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Himmatnagar Range
33. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Himmatnagar
34. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -1, Himmatnagar
35. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -2, Himmatnagar
36. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -3, Himmatnagar
37. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -4, Modasa
38. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer Range -4, Himmatnagar
39. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, TDS, Ahmedabad
40. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, TDS, Ahmedabad
41. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, TDS, Ahmedabad
42. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -1, Ahmedabad
43. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -2, Ahmedabad
44. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -3, Ahmedabad
45. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -4, Ahmedabad
46. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Gandhinagar
47. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax -TDS, Baroda
48. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax -TDS, Baroda
49. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -I, Baroda
50. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS-2, Baroda
51. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Anand
52. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Bharuch
53. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax -TDS, Rajkot
54. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax -TDS, Rajkot
55. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -I, Rajkot
56. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS-2, Rajkot
57. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Jamnagar
58. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Gandhidham
59. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax -TDS, Surat
60. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax -TDS, Surat
61. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -I, Surat
62. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -2, Surat
63. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -3, Surat
64. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS -4, Surat
65. O/o The Income Tax Officer, TDS, Valsad
66. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -(Comp. Operation), Ahmedabad
67. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax System, Ahmedabad
68. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax System -I, Ahmedabad
69. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax -System, Ahmedabad
70. O/o The Income Tax Officer, System -1, Ahmedabad
71. O/o The Income Tax Officer, System -2, Ahmedabad
72. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax System, Baroda
73. O/o The Income Tax Officer System -1, Baroda
74. O/o The Income Tax Officer, MSTU, Baroda
75. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax System, Rajkot
76. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, System, Rajkot
77. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, System, Surat
78. O/o The Income Tax Officer, System, Surat
79. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -Audit, Ahmedabad
80. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -Audit, Ahmedabad
81. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax -Audit, Ahmedabad

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 82. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-I, Ahmedabad                      | 113. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(3), Ahmedabad            |
| 83. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-2, Ahmedabad                      | 114. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -5, Ahmedabad            |
| 84. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-3, Ahmedabad                      | 115. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -6, Ahmedabad       |
| 85. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-4, Ahmedabad                      | 116. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-6, Ahmedabad  |
| 86. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-5, Ahmedabad                      | 117. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(1), Ahmedabad            |
| 87. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-6, Ahmedabad                      | 118. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(2), Ahmedabad            |
| 88. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-7, Ahmedabad                      | 119. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(3), Ahmedabad            |
| 89. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -HQ. -I, Int. Taxation Ahmedabad  | 120. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(4), Ahmedabad            |
| 90. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-HQ. -2, Exemption, Ahmedabad      | 121. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(5), Ahmedabad            |
| 91. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -Central- I, Ahmedabad            | 122. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -6, Ahmedabad            |
| 92. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -Central- 2, Ahmedabad            | 123. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -7, Ahmedabad       |
| 93. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Gandhinagar                      | 124. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -7, Ahmedabad |
| 94. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -1, Baroda                        | 125. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(1), Ahmedabad            |
| 95. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -2, Baroda                        | 126. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(2), Ahmedabad            |
| 96. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -3, Baroda                        | 127. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(3), Ahmedabad            |
| 97. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -4, Baroda                        | 128. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(4), Ahmedabad            |
| 98. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -1, Rajkot                        | 129. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -7, Ahmedabad            |
| 99. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -2, Rajkot                        | 130. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad -4, Ahmedabad  |
| 100. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -3, Rajkot                       | 131. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -8, Ahmedabad       |
| 101. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP. Jamnagar                        | 132. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -8, Ahmedabad |
| 102. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Audit, Surat           | 133. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(1), Ahmedabad            |
| 103. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP-I, Surat                         | 134. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(2), Ahmedabad            |
| 104. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -2, Surat                        | 135. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(3), Ahmedabad            |
| 105. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP -3, Surat                        | 136. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(4), Ahmedabad            |
| 106. O/o The Income Tax Officer, IAP, Valsad                          | 137. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -8, Ahmedabad            |
| 107. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-2, Ahmedabad | 138. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -9, Ahmedabad       |
| 108. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-3, Ahmedabad       | 139. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -9, Ahmedabad |
| 109. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -5, Ahmedabad           | 140. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -9(1), Ahmedabad            |
| 110. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -5, Ahmedabad     | 141. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -9(2), Ahmedabad            |
| 111. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(1), Ahmedabad                | 142. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -9(3), Ahmedabad            |
| 112. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(2), Ahmedabad                | 143. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -9(4), Ahmedabad            |



144.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -9, Ahmedabad	170	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle, Surendernagar
145.	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Palanpur Range	171	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Surendernagar
146.	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Palanpur	172	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Surendernagar
147.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Palanpur	173	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3 Surendernagar
148.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Palanpur	174	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Surendernagar
149.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3, Palanpur	175	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Surendernagar Range
150.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Palanpur	176	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-6, Ahmedabad
151.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Palanpur Range	177	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -12, Ahmedabad
152.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Palanpur Range	178	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -12, Ahmedabad
153.	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-3, Ahmedabad	179	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -12(1), Ahmedabad
154.	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-5, Ahmedabad	180	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -12(2), Ahmedabad
155.	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -10, Ahmedabad	181	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -12(3), Ahmedabad
156.	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -10, Ahmedabad	182	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -12(4), Ahmedabad
157.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -10(1), Ahmedabad	183	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -12, Ahmedabad
158.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -10(2), Ahmedabad	184	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax , Bhavnagar Range -1
159.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -10(3), Ahmedabad	185	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -1, Bhavnagar
160.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -10(4), Ahmedabad	186	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Bhavnagar
161.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -10, Ahmedabad	187	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Bhavnagar
162.	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -11, Ahmedabad	188	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Bhavnagar
163.	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -11, Ahmedabad	189	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Bhavnagar
164.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -11(1), Ahmedabad	190	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -1, Bhavnagar
165.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -11(2), Ahmedabad	191	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax , Bhavnagar Range -2
166.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -11(3), Ahmedabad	192	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Bhavnagar
167.	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -11(4), Ahmedabad	193	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Bhavnagar
168.	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -11, Ahmedabad	194	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Bhavnagar
169.	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax , Surendernagar	195	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Bhavnagar
		196	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Bhavnagar
		197	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -2, Bhavnagar



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 198. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Ahmedabad-4, Ahmedabad | 221. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Gandhi Nagar, Ahmedabad          |
| 199. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -Ahmedabad-7                  | 222. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax , Patan Range               |
| 200. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax -13 Ahmedabad           | 223. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle, Patan                 |
| 201. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle-13, Ahmedabad     | 224. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -1, Patan                            |
| 202. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-13(1), Ahmedabad                | 225. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward-2, Patan                             |
| 203. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-13(2), Ahmedabad                | 226. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward-3, Patan, Mehsana                    |
| 204. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-13(3), Ahmedabad                | 227. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-4, Patan, Mehsana                   |
| 205. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-13(4), Ahmedabad                | 228. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range, Patan                           |
| 206. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range-13, Ahmedabad                | 229. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Gandhi Nagar Range          |
| 207. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax-14 Ahmedabad            | 230. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle, Gandhi Nagar          |
| 208. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax , Circle - 14, Ahmedabad  | 231. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Gandhinagar                     |
| 209. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-14(1), Ahmedabad                | 232. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Gandhinagar                     |
| 210. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-14(2), Ahmedabad                | 233. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3, Gandhinagar                     |
| 211. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-14(3), Ahmedabad                | 234. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Gandhinagar                     |
| 212. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-14(4), Ahmedabad                | 235. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range Gandhinagar                      |
| 213. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range-14, Ahmedabad                | 236. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Mehsana Range               |
| 214. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax-15, Ahmedabad           | 237. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle, Mehsana               |
| 215. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle - 15, Ahmedabad   | 238. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Mehsana                         |
| 216. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-15(1), Ahmedabad                | 239. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Mehsana                         |
| 217. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-15(2), Ahmedabad                | 240. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3, Mehsana                         |
| 218. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-15(3), Ahmedabad                | 241. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Mehsana                         |
| 219. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-15(4), Ahmedabad                | 242. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -Mahesana                        |
| 220. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range-15, Ahmedabad                | 243. O/o The Directorate General of Income Tax (Inv.), Ahmedabad          |
|   | 244. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Ahmedabad                     |
|   | 245. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit - 1, Ahmedabad     |
|   | 246. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -1 / 1, Ahmedabad    |
|   | 247. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit - 1 /2, Ahmedabad |
|   | 248. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit - 1 /3, Ahmedabad |

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 249. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Bhavnagar               | 277. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Ahmedabad              |
| 250. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.), Bhavnagar                       | 278. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -1(1), Ahmedabad         |
| 251. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv./AIU), Ahmedabad                   | 279. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -1(2), Ahmedabad         |
| 252. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.), Unit -1, Ahmedabad              | 280. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1(3), Ahmedabad             |
| 253. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -2, Ahmedabad    | 281. O/o The Income Tax Officer Central, Ward -1(4), Ahmedabad                  |
| 254. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -2/1, Ahmedabad | 282. O/o Tax Recovery Officer Central, Range-1, Ahmedabad                       |
| 255. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Mehsana              | 283. O/o The Income Tax Officer Central, Ward -1(1), Ahmedabad                  |
| 256. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Mehsana                 | 284. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range, Surat             |
| 257. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.), Unit -2, Ahmedabad              | 285. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -1, Surat        |
| 258. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.), Mehsana                         | 286. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2, Surat           |
| 259. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Baroda                | 287. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -3, Surat        |
| 260. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -1, Baroda         | 288. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -4, Surat        |
| 261. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -2, Baroda      | 289. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Central, Surat                                 |
| 262. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.), Baroda                          | 290. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Central-2, Ahmedabad                   |
| 263. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Bharuch              | 291. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Ahmedabad              |
| 264. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Surat                       | 292. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2(1), Ahmedabad |
| 265. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -1, Surat        | 293. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2(3), Ahmedabad |
| 266. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -1, Surat          | 294. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2(4), Ahmedabad |
| 267. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -3, Surat       | 295. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Central Range -2, Ahmedabad                  |
| 268. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Valsad                  | 296. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Central Ward -2(1), Ahmedabad                  |
| 269. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.), Surat                           | 297. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range, Baroda            |
| 270. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Rajkot                | 298. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -1, Baroda       |
| 271. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -I, Rajkot      | 299. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2, Baroda       |
| 272. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit -2, Rajkot      |   |
| 273. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.) & DDO, Rajkot                    |   |
| 274. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Jamnagar             |   |
| 275. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Gandhidham           |   |
| 276. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax Central-1, Ahmedabad            |   |

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 300. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer & Income Tax Officer, Central Ward -1, Baroda | 333. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -4, Baroda                          |
| 301. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2, Rajkot          | 334. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(1), Baroda                                       |
| 302. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle -2, Rajkot       | 335. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(2), (Additional Charge), Baroda                  |
| 303. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Central Ward, Rajkot                           | 336. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(3), (Additional Charge), Baroda                  |
| 304. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Baroda                           | 337. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(4), Baroda                                       |
| 305. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Baroda-1                               | 338. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -4, Baroda  |
| 306. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Baroda                 | 339. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Khera Range                                |
| 307. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1(1), Baroda                | 340. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Khera  |
| 308. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1(2), Baroda                | 341. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Khera   |
| 309. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Baroda                             | 342. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Khera   |
| 310. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Baroda                             | 343. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3, Khera   |
| 311. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Baroda                             | 344. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Khera   |
| 312. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Baroda                             | 345. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Tax Recovery Officer) Nadiad (Additional Charge), Khera |
| 313. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -1, Baroda                             | 346. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Anand Range (Additional Charge),           |
| 314. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -2, Baroda                  | 347. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Anand Circle                              |
| 315. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -2(1), Baroda                | 348. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Anand   |
| 316. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -2(2), Baroda                | 349. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Anand   |
| 317. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Baroda                             | 350. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3, Anand   |
| 318. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Baroda                             | 351. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Anand   |
| 319. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Baroda                             | 352. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -Anand  |
| 320. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Baroda                             | 353. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (TDS), Anand   |
| 321. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(5), Baroda                             | 354. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Baroda-3, Baroda                                 |
| 322. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(6), Baroda                             | 355. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -5, Baroda                           |
| 323. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -2, Baroda                             | 356. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -5, Baroda                          |
| 324. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -3, Baroda                  | 357. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(1), Baroda                                       |
| 325. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -3, Baroda                   | 358. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(2), Baroda                                       |
| 326. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(1), Baroda                             | 359. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(3), Baroda                                       |
| 327. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(2), Baroda                             | 360. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(4), Baroda                                       |
| 328. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(3), Petlad                             | 361. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -5, Baroda  |
| 329. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(4), Petlad                             | 362. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Bharuch Range, Bharuch                     |
| 330. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -3, Baroda                             | 363. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Bharuch (Addl. Charge)                       |
| 331. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax Baroda-2, Baroda                        | 364. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Bharuch   |
| 332. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4, Baroda                 | 365. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Bharuch   |

366	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3, Bharuch	402	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Rajkot
367	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4, Bharuch	403	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Rajkot
368	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5, Bharuch	404	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1, Rajkot
369	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Bharuch	405	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Rajkot
370	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Bharuch	406	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Rajkot
371	O/o The Income Tax Officer (CIB), Bharuch	407	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Rajkot
372	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Panchmahal Range	408	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Rajkot
373	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Panchmahal Circle	409	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer Range -1, Rajkot
374	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Godhra	410	O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS) Range, Rajkot
375	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Godhra	411	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS) Range, Rajkot
376	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Dahod	412	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS) -1, Rajkot
377	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Dahod	413	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS) -2, Rajkot
378	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer (Godhra)	414	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS) -3, Jamnagar
379	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -4, Baroda	415	O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS) -4, Gandhidham
380	O/o The Joint / Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -6, Baroda	416	O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -2, Rajkot
381	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax -6, Baroda	417	O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -2, Rajkot
382	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(1), Baroda	418	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -2, Rajkot
383	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(2), Baroda	419	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Rajkot
384	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(3), Baroda	420	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Rajkot
385	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(4), Baroda	421	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Rajkot
386	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-6 Baroda	422	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Rajkot
387	O/o The Joint / Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -7, Baroda	423	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -2, Rajkot
388	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -7, Baroda	424	O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -3, Rajkot
389	O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -7(1), Baroda	425	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -3, Rajkot
390	O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -7(2), Baroda	426	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(1), Rajkot
391	O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -7(3), Baroda	427	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(2), Rajkot
392	O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -7(4), Baroda	428	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(3), Rajkot
393	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -7, Baroda	429	O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -3(4), Rajkot
394	O/o The Joint / Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -8, Baroda	430	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -3, Rajkot
395	O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -8, Baroda	431	O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -4, Rajkot
396	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(1), Baroda	432	O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -4, Rajkot
397	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(2), Baroda	433	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(1), Rajkot
398	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(3), Baroda	434	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(2), Rajkot
399	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -8(4), Baroda	435	O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(3), Rajkot
400	O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -8, Baroda		
401	O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Rajkot		

436. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(4), Rajkot	468. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Jamnagar
437. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -4, Rajkot	469. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -2, Jamnagar
438. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -3, Rajkot	470. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Jamnagar
439. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -5, Rajkot,	471. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Jamnagar
440. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -5, Rajkot	472. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Porbander
441. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(1), Rajkot	473. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Porbander
442. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(2), Rajkot	474. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -1, Jamnagar
443. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(3), Morbi	475. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3, Jamnagar
444. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(4), Morbi	476. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -3, Jamnagar
445. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -5, Rajkot	477. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(1), Jamnagar
446. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -1, Junagadh	478. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(2), Jamnagar
447. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1, Junagadh	479. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(3), Jamnagar
448. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Junagadh	480. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(4), Jamnagar
449. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Junagadh	481. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -3, Jamnagar
450. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Veraval	482. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Gandhidham
451. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Veraval	483. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Gandhidham Circle, Gandhidham
452. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -1, Junagadh	484. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax, (Int. Taxation), Gandhidham
453. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -2, Junagadh	485. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Int. Taxation), Gandhidham
454. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -2, Junagadh	486. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Gandhidham
455. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Junagadh	487. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Gandhidham
456. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Junagadh	488. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Tax Recovery Officer), Gandhidham
457. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Amreli	489. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1, Bhuj
458. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Amreli	490. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2, Bhuj
459. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer Range -2, Junagadh	491. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (TDS), Gandhidham
460. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Jamnagar	492. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Surat
461. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Jamnagar	493. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Surat
462. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Circle -1, Jamnagar	494. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -1, Surat
463. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Jamnagar	495. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1, Surat
464. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(2), Jamnagar	496. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(1), Surat
465. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(3), Dwarka	
466. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -1(4), Dwarka	
467. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer, Range -1, Jamnagar	



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 497. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(2), Surat               | 533. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -6, Surat     |
| 498. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(3), Surat               | 534. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -6, Surat   |
| 499. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-1(4), Surat               | 535. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(1), Surat                |
| 500. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-1, Surat                      | 536. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(2), Surat                |
| 501. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Income Tax), Surat            | 537. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(3), Surat                |
| 502. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (OSD)-I, Surat                 | 538. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -6(4), Surat                |
| 503. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (OSD)-II, Surat                | 539. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-6, Surat                        |
| 504. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -2, Surat   | 540. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax (OSD), Surat       |
| 505. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -2, Surat | 541. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP) -II, Surat                  |
| 506. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(1), Surat              | 542. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -III, Surat               |
| 507. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(2), Surat              | 543. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -7, Surat     |
| 508. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(3), Surat              | 544. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -7, Surat   |
| 509. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -2(4), Surat              | 545. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(1), Surat                |
| 510. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-2, Surat                      | 546. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(2), Surat                |
| 511. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax Range -3, Surat   | 547. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(3), Surat                |
| 512. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -3, Surat    | 548. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -7(4), Surat                |
| 513. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(1), Surat              | 549. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -7, Surat                       |
| 514. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(2), Surat              | 550. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -8, Surat     |
| 515. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(3), Surat              | 551. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -8, Surat   |
| 516. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -3(4), Surat              | 552. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-8(1), Surat                 |
| 517. O/o The Tax Recovery Office -3, Surat                      | 553. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-8(2), Surat                 |
| 518. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -II, Surat              | 554. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-8(3), Surat                 |
| 519. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -4, Surat   | 555. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-8(4), Surat                 |
| 520. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -4, Surat | 556. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-8, Surat                        |
| 521. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(1), Surat              | 557. O/o The Jt./Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -9, Surat |
| 522. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(2), Surat              | 558. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -9, Surat      |
| 523. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(3), Surat              | 559. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-9(1), Surat                 |
| 524. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -4(4), Surat              | 560. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-9(2), Surat                 |
| 525. O/o The Tax Recovery Office -4, Surat                      | 561. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-9(3), Surat                 |
| 526. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range -5, Surat   | 562. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward-9(4), Surat                 |
| 527. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -5, Surat | 563. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -9, Surat                       |
| 528. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(1), Surat              | 564. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Valsad                   |
| 529. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(2), Surat              | 565. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Valsad             |
| 530. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(3), Surat              | 566. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle-1, Valsad   |
| 531. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Ward -5(4), Surat              |   |
| 532. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-5, Surat                      |   |



- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 567. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -1 & DDO, Valsad                                   | 604. O/o The Income Tax Officer-I & C.I. -1, Baroda                            |
| 568. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -2, Valsad   | 605. O/o The Income Tax Officer-I & C.I. -2, Baroda                            |
| 569. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -3, Valsad   | 606. O/o The Income Tax Officer-I & C.I., Anand                                |
| 570. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -4, Valsad   | 607. O/o The Income Tax Officer-I & C.I. , Bharuch                             |
| 571. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -Valsad   | 608. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax-I & C.I. , Rajkot                    |
| 572. O/o The Income Tax Officer (CIB), Valsad   | 609. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax-I & C.I. , Rajkot                   |
| 573. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP), Valsad   | 610. O/o The Income Tax Officer, I & C.I. -1, Rajkot                           |
| 574. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS) Valsad  | 611. O/o The Income Tax Officer, I & C.I. , Jamnagar                           |
| 575. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS) Valsad  | 612. O/o The Income Tax Officer, 1 & C.I., Bhavnagar                           |
| 576. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Navsari                                  | 613. O/o The Income Tax Officer, 1 & C.I., Junagadh                            |
| 577. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax Circle -1, Navsari                       | 614. O/o The Income Tax Officer, 1 & C.I., Gandhidham                          |
| 578. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -1, Navsari  | 615. O/o The Income Tax Officer, 1 & C.I., Surat                               |
| 579. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -2, Navsari  | 616. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax, 1 & C.I., Surat                    |
| 580. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -3, Navsari  | 617. O/o The Income Tax Officer, 1 & C.I.-1, Surat                             |
| 581. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -4, Navsari  | 618. O/o The Income Tax Officer, I & C.I.-2, Surat                             |
| 582. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -Navsari  | 619. O/o The Income Tax Officer, 1 & C.I.-Valsad                               |
| 583. O/o The Income Tax Officer (CIB), Navsari  | 620. O/o The Income Tax Officer, I & C.I.-Navsari                              |
| 584. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Inv.) (CIB), Navsari                                   | 621. O/o The Director of Income Tax -R.T.I, Ahmedabad                          |
| 585. O/o The Joint Commissioner of Income Tax, Vapi                                     | 622. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax-R.T.I., Ahmedabad                    |
| 586. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Vapi                                    | 623. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax-R.T.I., Ahmedabad                      |
| 587. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -1, Vapi   | 624. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax-R.T.I., Ahmedabad                      |
| 588. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -2, Vapi   | 625. O/o The Income Tax Officer -R. T.I -1, Ahmedabad                          |
| 589. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -3, Vapi   | 626. O/o The Income Tax Officer -R. T.I -2, Ahmedabad                          |
| 590. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer -Vapi   | 627. O/o The Income Tax Officer -R.T.I -3, Ahmedabad                           |
| 591. O/o The Income Tax Officer Ward -4, Daman, Vapi                                    | 628. O/o The Income Tax Officer -OSD, Ahmedabad                                |
| 592. O/o The Jt./Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Vapi                         | 629. O/o The Income Tax Officer -MSTU, Ahmedabad                               |
| 593. O/o The Income Tax Officer ( IAP) -I, Vapi   | 630. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax -I.T. & T.P.O.-1, Ahmedabad          |
| 594. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP) -II, Vapi   | 631. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax, T.P.O.-2, Ahmedabad                   |
| 595. O/o The Income Tax Officer ( IAP) -III, Vapi                                       | 632. O/o The Director of Income Tax, International Taxation, Ahmedabad         |
| 596. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP), Valsad   | 633. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax , International Taxation, Ahmedabad |
| 597. O/o The Income Tax Officer (Int. Taxation), Vapi                                   | 634. O/o The Income Tax Officer -International Taxation -1, Ahmedabad          |
| 598. O/o The Director of Income Tax -Intelligence and Criminal Investigation, Ahmedabad | 635. O/o The Income Tax Officer -International Taxation -2, Ahmedabad          |
| 599. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax-I & C.I. , Ahmedabad                          |  |
| 600. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax-I & C.I. , Ahmedabad                         |  |
| 601. O/o The Income Tax Officer-I & C.I. , Ahmedabad                                    |  |
| 602. O/o The Income Tax Officer-I & C.I. , Mehsana                                      |  |
| 603. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax-I & C.I. , Baroda                        |  |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>636. O/o The Income Tax Officer -International Taxation -3, Ahmedabad</p> <p>637. O/o The Income Tax Officer -International Taxation, Baroda, Ahmedabad</p> <p>638. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax , International Taxation, Gandhidham</p> <p>639. O/o The Income Tax Officer (International Taxation), Gandhidham</p> <p>640. O/o The Income Tax Officer (International Taxation), Surat</p> <p>641. O/o The Income Tax Officer (International Taxation), Rajkot</p> <p>642. O/o The Director of Income Tax-Exemption, Ahmedabad</p> <p>643. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax-Exemption, Ahmedabad</p> <p>644. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax-Exemption, Ahmedabad</p> <p>645. O/o The Income Tax Officer-Exemption, Ahmedabad</p> <p>646. O/o The Tax Recovery Officer-Exemption, Ahmedabad</p> <p>647. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax -Exemption, Surendernagar, Ahmedabad</p> <p>648. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax-Exemption, Himmatnagar, Ahmedabad</p> <p>649. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax-Exemption, Palanpur, Ahmedabad</p> <p>650. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax-Exemption, Bhavnagar, Ahmedabad</p> <p><b>Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Mumbai Region and Subordinate Offices</b></p> <p>1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-I, Mumbai</p> <p>2. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-II, Mumbai</p> <p>3. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-III, Mumbai</p> <p>4. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-IV, Mumbai</p> <p>5. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-V, Mumbai</p> <p>6. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-VI, Mumbai</p> <p>7. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-VII, Mumbai</p> | <p>8. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-IX, Mumbai</p> <p>9. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-X, Mumbai</p> <p>10. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-XI, Mumbai</p> <p>11. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-XII, Mumbai</p> <p>12. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-XIII, Mumbai</p> <p>13. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Central)- 1, Mumbai</p> <p>14. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -2, Mumbai</p> <p>15. O/o The Director General of Income Tax (Inv.), Mumbai</p> <p>16. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (HQ) Admn., Mumbai</p> <p>17. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (HQ) System, Mumbai</p> <p>18. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (HQ) Co-ordination, Mumbai</p> <p>19. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (HQ) Personal, Mumbai</p> <p>20. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (HQ) Vig.&amp;Tech., Mumbai</p> <p>21. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (HQ) (Inv.), Mumbai</p> <p>22. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Mumbai</p> <p>23. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -2, Mumbai</p> <p>24. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -3, Mumbai</p> <p>25. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -4, Mumbai</p> <p>26. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -5, Mumbai</p> <p>27. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -6, Mumbai</p> <p>28. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -7, Mumbai</p> <p>29. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -8, Mumbai</p> <p>30. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -9, Mumbai</p> <p>31. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -10, Mumbai</p> <p>32. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -11, Mumbai</p> <p>33. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -12, Mumbai</p> <p>34. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -13, Mumbai</p> |
|---|--|

35. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax., 14, Mumbai
36. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -15, Mumbai
37. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -16, Mumbai
38. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -17, Mumbai
39. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -18, Mumbai
40. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -19, Mumbai
41. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -20, Mumbai
42. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -21, Mumbai
43. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -22, Mumbai
44. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -23, Mumbai
45. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -24, Mumbai
46. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -25, Mumbai
47. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -26, Mumbai
48. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -28, Mumbai
49. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -29, Mumbai
50. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax ,(TDS), Mumbai
51. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Inv.) -I, Mumbai
52. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Inv.) -II, Mumbai
53. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -I, Mumbai
54. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -II, Mumbai
55. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -III, Mumbai
56. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) -IV, Mumbai
57. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Judicial), Mumbai
58. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit) -I, Mumbai
59. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit) -II, Mumbai
60. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Competent Authority) , Mumbai
61. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Computer Operation), Mumbai
62. O/o The Member (Income Tax Settlement Commissioner) -(ITSC), Mumbai
63. O/o The Director of Income Tax -(ITSC), Mumbai
64. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) -I (ITSC), Mumbai
65. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.)-II (ITSC), Mumbai
66. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -I, Mumbai
67. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -II, Mumbai
68. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -III, Mumbai
69. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -IV, Mumbai
70. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -V, Mumbai
71. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -VI, Mumbai
72. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -VII, Mumbai
73. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT)-VIII, Mumbai
74. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT)-IX, Mumbai
75. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT)-X, Mumbai
76. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT)-XI, Mumbai
77. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -XII, Mumbai
78. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (D.R.) (ITAT) -XIII, Mumbai
79. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (LTU), Mumbai
80. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -1, Mumbai
81. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -2, Mumbai
82. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -3, Mumbai
83. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -4, Mumbai
84. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -5, Mumbai
85. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -6, Mumbai
86. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -7, Mumbai
87. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -8, Mumbai
88. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -9, Mumbai

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 89. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -10, Mumbai  | 113. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -34, Mumbai       |
| 90. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -11, Mumbai  | 114. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -35, Mumbai       |
| 91. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -12, Mumbai  | 115. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -36, Mumbai       |
| 92. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -13, Mumbai  | 116. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -37, Mumbai       |
| 93. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -14, Mumbai  | 117. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -38, Mumbai       |
| 94. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -15, Mumbai  | 118. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -39, Mumbai       |
| 95. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -16, Mumbai  | 119. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -40, Mumbai       |
| 96. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -17, Mumbai  | 120. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -41, Mumbai       |
| 97. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -18, Mumbai  | 121. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1(1), Mumbai |
| 98. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -19, Mumbai  | 122. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1(2), Mumbai |
| 99. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -20, Mumbai  | 123. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1(3), Mumbai |
| 100. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -21, Mumbai | 124. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2(1), Mumbai |
| 101. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -22, Mumbai | 125. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2(2), Mumbai |
| 102. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -23, Mumbai | 126. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2(3), Mumbai |
| 103. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -24, Mumbai | 127. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(1), Mumbai |
| 104. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -25, Mumbai | 128. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(2), Mumbai |
| 105. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -26, Mumbai | 129. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3(3), Mumbai |
| 106. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -27, Mumbai | 130. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4(1), Mumbai |
| 107. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -28, Mumbai | 131. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4(2), Mumbai |
| 108. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -29, Mumbai | 132. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4(3), Mumbai |
| 109. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -30, Mumbai | 133. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -5(1), Mumbai |
| 110. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -31, Mumbai | 134. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -5(2), Mumbai |
| 111. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -32, Mumbai | 135. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -5(3), Mumbai |
| 112. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -33, Mumbai | 136. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -6(1), Mumbai |

137. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -6(2), Mumbai	161. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -14(2), Mumbai
138. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -6(3), Mumbai	162. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -14(3), Mumbai
139. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -7(1), Mumbai	163. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -15(1), Mumbai
140. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -7(2), Mumbai	164. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -15(2), Mumbai
141. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -7(3), Mumbai	165. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -15(3), Mumbai
142. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -8(1), Mumbai	166. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -16(1), Mumbai
143. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -8(2), Mumbai	167. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -16(2), Mumbai
144. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -8(3), Mumbai	168. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -16(3), Mumbai
145. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -9(1), Mumbai	169. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -17(1), Mumbai
146. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -9(2), Mumbai	170. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -17(2), Mumbai
147. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -9(3), Mumbai	171. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -17(3), Mumbai
148. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -10(1), Mumbai	172. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -18(1), Mumbai
149. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -10(2), Mumbai	173. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -18(2), Mumbai
150. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -10(3), Mumbai	174. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -18(3), Mumbai
151. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -11(1), Mumbai	175. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -19(1), Mumbai
152. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -11(2), Mumbai	176. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -19(2), Mumbai
153. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -11(3), Mumbai	177. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -19(3), Mumbai
154. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -12(1), Mumbai	178. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -20(1), Mumbai
155. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -12(2), Mumbai	179. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -20(2), Mumbai
156. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -12(3), Mumbai	180. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -20(3), Mumbai
157. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -13(1), Mumbai	181. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -21(1), Mumbai
158. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -13(2), Mumbai	182. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -21(2), Mumbai
159. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -13(3), Mumbai	183. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -21(3), Mumbai
160. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -14(1), Mumbai	184. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -22(1), Mumbai



- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 185. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -22(2), Mumbai     | 209. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -5, Mumbai        |
| 186. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -22(3), Mumbai     | 210. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -6, Mumbai        |
| 187. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -23(1), Mumbai     | 211. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -7, Mumbai        |
| 188. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -23(2), Mumbai     | 212. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -8, Mumbai        |
| 189. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -23(3), Mumbai     | 213. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -9, Mumbai        |
| 190. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -24(1), Mumbai     | 214. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -10, Mumbai       |
| 191. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -24(2), Mumbai     | 215. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Judicial Range -I, Mumbai       |
| 192. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -24(3), Mumbai     | 216. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -II, Mumbai       |
| 193. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -25(1), Mumbai     | 217. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Audit Range -I(I), Mumbai       |
| 194. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -25(2), Mumbai     | 218. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Audit Range -I(II), Mumbai      |
| 195. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -25(3), Mumbai     | 219. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Audit Range -II, Mumbai         |
| 196. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -26(1), Mumbai     | 220. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, (Computer Operation) -1, Mumbai |
| 197. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -26(2), Mumbai     | 221. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, (Computer Operation) -2, Mumbai |
| 198. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -28(1), Mumbai     | 222. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, (L TU), Mumbai                  |
| 199. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -28(2), Mumbai     | 223. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - I, Mumbai             |
| 200. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -29(1), Mumbai     | 224. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - II, Mumbai            |
| 201. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -29(2), Mumbai     | 225. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - III, Mumbai           |
| 202. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, TDS Range -I, Mumbai     | 226. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - IV, Mumbai            |
| 203. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, TDS Range -II, Mumbai    | 227. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - V, Mumbai             |
| 204. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, TDS Range -III, Mumbai   | 228. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - VI, Mumbai            |
| 205. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -1, Mumbai | 229. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - VII, Mumbai           |
| 206. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -2, Mumbai | 230. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - VIII, Mumbai          |
| 207. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -3, Mumbai | 231. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax, (Inv.) Unit - IX, Mumbai            |
| 208. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range -4, Mumbai | 232. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (ITSC) -1, Mumbai                    |



- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 233. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (ITSC) -2, Mumbai      | 12. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -III, Nagpur                        |
| 234. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT) -I, Mumbai   | 13. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -5, Nagpur             |
| 235. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT) -II, Mumbai  | 14. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -6, Nagpur             |
| 236. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-III, Mumbai  | 15. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Amravati Range, Amravati     |
| 237. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-IV, Mumbai   | 16. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -IV, Nagpur                         |
| 238. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-V, Mumbai    | 17. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -7, Nagpur             |
| 239. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-VI, Mumbai   | 18. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -8, Nagpur             |
| 240. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-VII, Mumbai  | 19. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Chandrapur Range, Chandrapur |
| 241. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-VIII, Mumbai | 20. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Bhandra                                    |
| 242. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-IX, Mumbai   | 21. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Gondia                                     |
| 243. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-X, Mumbai    | 22. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Nagpur                   |
| 244. O/o The Sr. Departmental Representative (ITAT)-XI, Mumbai   | 23. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) Range -I, Nagpur    |
| 245. O/o The Dy. Director (OL) / Asstt. Director (OL), Mumbai    | 24. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) Range -2, Nagpur    |
|  | 25. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax (Central) Circle, Akola      |

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Nagpur Region and Subordinate Offices**

- | S.No. | Name of the office   |
|-------|--|
| 1.    | O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Nagpur               |
| 2.    | O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Nagpur                  |
| 3.    | O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Nagpur     |
| 4.    | O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Nagpur     |
| 5.    | O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Akola Range, Akola   |
| 6.    | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Khamgaon                           |
| 7.    | O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -II, Nagpur                 |
| 8.    | O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3, Nagpur     |
| 9.    | O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4, Nagpur     |
| 10.   | O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Wardha Range, Wardha |
| 11.   | O/o The Income Tax Officer, Yavatmal                           |

- |   |
|---|
| 26. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -I, Nagpur  |
| 27. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal) -II, Nagpur |
| 28. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Nagpur        |
| 29. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Nagpur      |
| 30. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (ITAT), Nagpur       |
| 31. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Nagpur           |

**National Academy of Direct Taxes, Nagpur and Subordinate Offices**

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | National Academy of Direct Taxes, Nagpur             |
| 2. | Direct Taxes Regional Training Institute, Lucknow    |
| 3. | Direct Taxes Regional Training Institute, Mumbai     |
| 4. | Direct Taxes Regional Training Institute, Ahmedabad  |
| 5. | Direct Taxes Regional Training Institute, Chandigarh |
| 6. | Direct Taxes Regional Training Institute, Kolkata    |

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Bengaluru Region and Subordinate Offices**

**S.No. Name of the office**

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Bengaluru -I Region**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -I, Bengaluru
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -II, Bengaluru
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Bengaluru
4. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Bengaluru
5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -(C.P.C), Bengaluru
6. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal -II), Bengaluru
7. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range-18, Bengaluru
8. M.S.T.U, Bengaluru

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax -II, Bengaluru Region**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax-III, Bengaluru
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax-IV, Bengaluru
3. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal)-IV, Bengaluru
4. O/o The Member (Appropriate Authority), Bengaluru

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax -III, Bengaluru Region**

1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax-III, Bengaluru
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax , Mysore
3. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -I, Mysore
4. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range-2, Mysore
5. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Madikeri

**Directorate General of Income Tax (Inv.), Bengaluru Region**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Bengaluru
2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax Central, Range -2, Bengaluru
3. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Unit-II, Bengaluru

**Other Offices (Whose Head Quarters are in Delhi & Nagpur)**

1. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, DTRTI, Bengaluru

2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, (LTU), Bengaluru
3. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Int. Taxation), Bengaluru
4. O/o The Income Tax, Ombudsman, Bengaluru
5. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Intelligence) Range, Bengaluru

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Kerala Region and Subordinate Offices**

**S.No. Name of the office**

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Kochi Region**

1. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Kochi

**Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Kochi Charge**

2. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -1, Kochi
3. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Kochi
4. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -4, Kochi

**Commissioner of Income Tax -2 Kochi Charge**

5. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax -2 Kochi
6. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Kochi
7. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -3, Kochi
8. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Aluva Range, Aluva
9. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Mattancherry
10. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Thodupuzha

**Commissioner of Income Tax, Thisssur Charge**

11. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Thisssur
12. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Thisssur
13. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Thisssur
14. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Palakkad Range, Palakkad
15. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Guruvayoor

**Commissioner of Income Tax, Kozhikode Charge**

16. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Kozhikode
17. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -1, Kozhikode
18. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range -2, Kozhikode
19. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Kannur Range, Kannur

20. O/o The Dy./ Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Tirur

21. O/o The Income Tax Officer, Kasaragod

**Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS) Kochi Charge**

22. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS) Kochi

23. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Thissur

24. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Palakkad

25. O/o The Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Khozhikode

26. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Kannur

27. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Triuvananthapuram

28. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Kollam

29. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax (TDS), Kottayam

30. O/o The Income Tax Officer (TDS), Alappuzha

**Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit) Kochi Charge**

31. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Audit), Kochi

32. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP), Thissur

33. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP), Khozhikode

34. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP), Triuvananthapuram

35. O/o The Income Tax Officer (IAP), Kottayam

**Commissioner of Income Tax (Departmental Representative), Kochi Charge**

36. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Departmental Representative), Kochi

37. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Kochi

38. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Khozhikode

39. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax (Intt. Taxn.) & (T.P.), Kochi

40. O/o The Asstt. Commissioner of Income Tax (Intt. Taxn.) Triuvananthapuram

**Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Triuvananthapuram Region**

41. O/o The Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Triuvananthapuram Region

**Commissioner of Income Tax, Triuvananthapuram Charge**

42. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Triuvananthapuram Charge

43. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range-1, Triuvananthapuram

44. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax Range-2, Triuvananthapuram

45. O/o The Addl. Commissioner of Income Tax, Kollam Range, Kollam

**Commissioner of Income Tax, Kottayam Charge**

46. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax, Kottayam Charge, Kottayam

47. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Range Kottayam, Kottayam

48. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Alappuzha Range, Alappuzha

49. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Thiruvalla Range, Thiruvalla

50. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeal), Triuvananthapuram

**Directorate General of Income Tax (Inv.), Kochi Region**

51. O/o The Director General of Income Tax (Inv.), Kochi

52. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Kochi

53. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Kochi

54. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Thissur

55. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Palakkad

56. O/o The Asstt. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Kozhikode

57. O/o The Addl. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Thriuvananthapuram

58. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Kollam

59. O/o The Dy. Director of Income Tax (Inv.), Kottayam

**Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Kochi Region**

60. O/o The Commissioner of Income Tax (Central), Kochi

61. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range, Kochi

62. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Thissur

63. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Kozhikode

64. O/o The Addl./Jt. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Range, Triuvananthapuram

65. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Kollam

66. O/o The Dy. Commissioner of Income Tax, Central Circle, Kottayam

**Directorate of Income Tax (Intelligence), Kochi Region**

67. O/o The Director of Income Tax (Intelligence), Kochi  
 68. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Intelligence), Thissur  
 69. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Intelligence), Kozhikode  
 70. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Intelligence), Triuvananthapuram  
 71. O/o The Income Tax Officer, (Intelligence), Alappuzha  
 72. O/o The Income Tax Ombudsman, Kochi

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3095.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा आयकर नियमावली, 1962 (उक्त नियमावली) के नियम 5ग और 5ड के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (उक्त अधिनियम) की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनार्थ कर निर्धारण वर्ष 2011-2012 के आगे से संगठन नेशनल लॉ स्कूल आफ इंडिया यूनिवर्सिटी, बंगलौर को निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन सामाजिक विज्ञान अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों में लगी 'विश्वविद्यालय, कॉलेज या अन्य संस्था' की श्रेणी में अनुमोदित किया गया है, अर्थात:-

- (i) अनुमोदित संगठन को प्रदत्त राशि का उपयोग सामाजिक विज्ञान में अनुसंधान के लिए किया जाएगा;
- (ii) अनुमोदित संगठन अपने संकाय सदस्यों अथवा अपने नामांकित छात्रों के माध्यम से सामाजिक विज्ञान में अनुसंधान करेगा;
- (iii) अनुमोदित संगठन सामाजिक विज्ञान अनुसंधान के लिए इसके द्वारा प्राप्त राशि के संबंध में अलग खाता बही रखेगा जिसमें अनुसंधान करने के लिए प्रयुक्त राशि दर्शाई गई हो, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 288 की उपधारा (2) के स्पष्टीकरण में यथा परिभाषित किसी लेखाकार से अपनी खाता-बही की लेखा परीक्षा कराएगा और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 139 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत आय विवरणी प्रस्तुत करने की नियत तिथि तक ऐसे लेखाकार द्वारा विधिवत सत्यापित एवं हस्ताक्षरित लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट मामले में क्षेत्राधिकार रखने वाले आयकर आयुक्त अथवा आयकर निदेशक को प्रस्तुत करेगा;
- (iv) अनुमोदित संगठन सामाजिक विज्ञान में अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त दान तथा प्रयुक्त राशि का अलग विवरण रखेगा और उपर्युक्त लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट के साथ लेखा परीक्षक द्वारा विधिवत सत्यापित ऐसे विवरण की प्रति प्रस्तुत करेगा।

2. केन्द्र सरकार यह अनुमोदन वापस ले लेगी यदि अनुमोदित संगठन:

- (क) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iii) में उल्लिखित लेखा बही नहीं रखेगा; अथवा
- (ख) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iii) में उल्लिखित अपनी लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत नहीं करेगा; अथवा

- (ग) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iv) में उल्लिखित सामाजिक विज्ञान में अनुसंधान अथवा सांख्यिकीय अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त एवं प्रयुक्त दान का अपना विवरण प्रस्तुत नहीं करेगा; अथवा
- (घ) अपना अनुसंधान कार्य करना बंद कर देगा अथवा इसके अनुसंधान कार्य को ठीक नहीं पाया जाएगा; अथवा
- (ङ) उक्त नियमावली के नियम 5ग और 5ड के साथ पठित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 35 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (iii) के प्रावधानों के अनुरूप नहीं होगा तथा उनका पालन नहीं करेगा।

[अधिसूचना सं. 41/2012/फा.सं. 203/38/2011-आ.क.नि.-II]

सुरभि शर्मा, अवर सचिव (आ.क.नि.-I)

**(Department of Revenue)**

New Delhi, the 28th September, 2012

**S.O. 3095.**—It is hereby notified for general information that the organisation National Law School of India University, Bangalore has been approved by the Central Government for the purpose of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (said Act), read with Rules 5C and 5E of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 (said Rules), from Assessment year 2011-2012 onwards in the category of "University, College or Other Institution", engaged in research in social science research subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (i) The sums paid to the approved organization shall be utilized for research in social sciences;
- (ii) The approved organization shall carry out research in social science through its faculty members or its enrolled students;
- (iii) The approved organization shall maintain separate books of accounts in respect of the sums received by it for social sciences research, reflect therein the amounts used for carrying out research, get such books audited by an accountant as defined in the explanation to sub-section (2) of Section 288 of the said Act and furnish the report of such audit duly signed and verified by such accountant to the Commissioner of Income-tax or the Director of Income-tax having jurisdiction over the case, by the due date of furnishing the return of income under sub-section (1) of Section 139 of the said Act;
- (iv) The approved organization shall maintain a separate statement of donations received and amounts applied for research in social science and a copy of such statement duly certified by the auditor shall accompany the report of audit referred to above.



2. The Central Government shall withdraw the approval if the approved organization:—

- (a) fails to maintain separate books of accounts referred to in sub-paragraphs (iii) of paragraph 1; or
- (b) fails to furnish its audit report referred to in sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph 1; or
- (c) fails to furnish its statement of the donations received and sums applied for research in social science or statistical research referred to in sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph 1; or
- (d) ceases to carry on its research activities or its research activities are not found to be genuine; or
- (e) ceases to conform to and comply with the provisions of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the said Act read with rules 5C and 5E of the said Rules.

[Notification No. 41/2012/F. No. 203/38/2011/ITA-II]

SURABHI SHARMA, Under Secy. (ITA-I)

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3096.**—भारतीय लघु उद्योग विकास बैंक अधिनियम, 1989 (1989 का 39) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (2) के साथ पठित धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, आईडीबीआई बैंक लि. के कार्यपालक निदेशक श्री टी.आर. बजालिया (जन्म तिथि: 25.12.1953) को उनके पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से और 31.12.2013 अर्थात् उनके अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने तक अथवा अगले आदेश होने तक, जो भी पहले हो, भारतीय लघु उद्योग विकास बैंक (सिडबी) में उप-प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 7/1/2011-बीओ-I]

श्रेया गुहा, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3096.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 6 read with sub-section (2) of Section 6 of the Small Industries Development Bank of India Act, 1989 (39 of 1989), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri T.R. Bajalia (DoB: 25-12-1953), Executive Director, IDBI Bank Ltd. as Deputy Managing Director (DMD), Small Industries Development Bank of India (SIDBI) from the date of his taking over the charge of the post and upto 31-12-2013 i.e. the date of his attaining the age of superannuation or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 7/1/2011-BO.-I]

SREYA GUHA, Director

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3097.**—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970/1980 के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1), खंड 5, खंड 6, खंड 7 और खंड 8 के उपबंध (1) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970/1980 की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, एतद्वारा विजया बैंक की कार्यपालक निदेशक श्रीमती एस.ए. पनसे (जन्म तिथि: 28-01-1954) को उनके पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से 31-01-2014 तक अर्थात् उनके अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने की तारीख तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, इलाहाबाद बैंक के अध्यक्ष एवं प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 4/4/2011-बीओ-I]

श्रेया गुहा, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3097.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of Section 9 of The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970/1980 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 3, clause 5, clause 6, clause 7 and sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of The Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970/1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Smt. S.A. Panse (DoB: 28.01.1954), Executive Director, Vijaya Bank as the Chairman and Managing Director, Allahabad Bank, from the date of her taking over charge of the post till 31.01.2014 i.e. the date of her attaining the age of superannuation or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 4/4/2011-BO.-I]

SREYA GUHA, Director.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3098.**—औद्योगिक एवं वित्तीय पुनर्निर्माण अपीलीय प्राधिकरण (एएआईएफआर) के अध्यक्ष न्यायमूर्ति ए. गोपाल रेड्डी के त्यागपत्र देने के परिणामस्वरूप रुग्ण औद्योगिक कंपनी (विशेष उपबंध) अधिनियम, 1985 की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, श्री बादल के. दास, आईएएस (एमपी: 72) को एएआईएफआर में वरिष्ठतम सदस्य होने के कारण 03-10-2012 (पूर्वाह्न) से अगले आदेश होने तक, एएआईएफआर के अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करने हेतु प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फा. सं. 20(2)/2002-आईएफ-II/खंड-3]

रमण कुमार गौड़, अवर सचिव।

New Delhi, the 3rd October, 2012

**S.O. 3098.**—Consequent upon resignation of Justice A. Gopal Reddy, Chairman, Appellate Authority for

Industrial & Financial Reconstruction (AAIFR), the Central Government, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (5) of Section 6 of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985, hereby authorizes Shri Badal K. Das, IAS, (MP: 72) being the senior most Member in AAIFR, to act as Chairman, AAIFR w.e.f. 3-10-2012 (FN) and until further orders.

[F.No. 20(2)/2002-IF-II/Vol. 3]

RAMAN KUMAR GAUR, Under Secy.

(सीमा शुल्क, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क एवं सेवाकर आयुक्तालय)

पणजी, 3 अक्टूबर, 2012

सं. 1/2012-सीमा शुल्क (गैर प्रशुल्क)

का.आ. 3099.—भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, नई दिल्ली के सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 152 के खंड (ए) के अधीन दिनांक 1 जुलाई, 1994 की अधिसूचना सं. 33/94 सीमा शुल्क (गैर प्रशुल्क) द्वारा अधोहस्ताक्षरी को प्रत्यायोजित शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 9 के अंतर्गत 100% ई.ओ.यू. स्थापित करने के उद्देश्य से गोवा प्रांत के उत्तर गोवा जिले के तिसवाडी तालुका में स्थित सांताकृज गांव को एतद् द्वारा भंडारण स्टेशन घोषित किया जाता है। यह अधिसूचना भारत सरकार के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तिथि से प्रभावी होगा।

[फा.सं. III/76/लेलीसीस/2011-12/सी.एक्स. (तक.)]

वी.पी.सी. राव, आयुक्त

(OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS,  
CENTRAL EXCISE & SERVICE TAX)

Panaji, the 3rd October, 2012

No. 1/2012-Cus. (N.T.)

S.O. 3099.—In exercise of the powers delegated to the undersigned vide Notification No. 33/94-Cus.(NT) dated 1st July, 1994 by the Govt. of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi under clause (a) of Section 152 of the Customs Act, 1962, Village—Santacruz, Taluka-Tiswadi, District—North Goa in the state of Goa is hereby declared to be a warehousing station under Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 for the purpose of setting up of 100% EOU with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of Government of India.

[F.No. III/76/Lelesys/2011-12/CX(T)]

V. P. C. RAO, Commissioner

नई दिल्ली, 4 अक्टूबर, 2012

का.आ. 3100.—भारतीय स्टेट बैंक अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 23) की धारा 20 की उप-धारा (3) के साथ पठित धारा 19 के खण्ड (ग ख) और भारतीय स्टेट बैंक (कर्मचारी निदेशकों की नियुक्ति)

नियमावली, 1974 के नियम 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, एतद्द्वारा, आल इंडिया स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया आफिसर्स फेडरेशन के सीनियर वाइस प्रेसीडेंट, श्री एस. के. मुखर्जी (जन्म तिथि: 27-11-1955) को उनकी नियुक्ति की अधिसूचना की तारीख से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा उनके भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के एक अधिकारी न रहने तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के केन्द्रीय निदेशक-मंडल में अधिकारी कर्मचारी निदेशक के रूप में नामित करती है।

[फा.सं. 3/57/2012-बीओ-I]

विजय मल्होत्रा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th October, 2012

S.O. 3100.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (cb) of section (19) read with sub-section (3) of Section 20 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955) and rule 4 of The State Bank of India (Appointment of Employee Directors) Rules, 1974, the Central Government, after consultation with Reserve Bank of India, hereby nominates Shri S.K. Mukherjee (DoB: 27-11-1955), Senior Vice President, All India State Bank of India Officers' Federation as Officer Employee Director on the Central Board of State Bank of India for a period of three years from the date of notification of his appointment or until he ceases to be an officer of the State Bank of India or until further orders, whichever is the earliest.

[F.No. 3/57/2012-BO-I]

VIJAY MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2012

का.आ. 3101.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970/1980 के खंड 3 के उपखंड (1) और खंड 8 के उपखंड (1) के साथ पठित, बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970/1980 की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, एतद्द्वारा, इलाहाबाद बैंक के महाप्रबंधक श्री सतीश कुमार कालरा (जन्म तिथि: 25-08-1957) को 01-11-2012 को उनके पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से 31-08-2017 तक, अर्थात् उनके अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने की तारीख तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, आंध्रा बैंक के कार्यकारी निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 4/5/2011-बीओ-I]

विजय मल्होत्रा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2012

S.O. 3101.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of Section 9 of The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act,



1970/1980 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 3 and sub-clause (1) of Clause 8 of The Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970/1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri Satish Kumar Kalra (DoB : 25-08-1957), General Manager, Allahabad Bank as Executive Director, Andhra Bank, with effect from the date of his taking over charge of the post till 31-08-2017, I.E. the date of his superannuation or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F.No. 4/5/2011-BO-I]

VIJAY MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3102.**—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970/1980 के खंड 3 के उप-खंड (1) और खंड 8 के उप-खंड (1) के साथ पठित, बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970/1980 की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, एतद्द्वारा, पंजाब नैशनल बैंक के महाप्रबंधक श्री रंजन धवन (जन्म तिथि : 09-09-1955) को 01-11-2012 को या इसके पश्चात् उनके पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से 30-09-2015 तक, अर्थात् उनके अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने की तारीख तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, बैंक ऑफ बड़ौदा के कार्यकारी निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 4/5/2011-बीओ-I]

विजय मल्होत्रा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2012

**S.O. 3102.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of Section 9 of the The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970/1980 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 3 and sub-clause (1) of Clause 8 of The Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970/1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri Ranjan Dhawan (DoB : 09-09-1955), General Manager, Punjab National Bank as Executive Director, Bank of Baroda, with

effect from the date of his taking over charge of the post on or after 01-11-2012 till 30-09-2015, *i.e.* the date of his superannuation or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F.No. 4/5/2011-BO-I]

VIJAY MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3103.**—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970/1980 के खंड 3 के उप-खंड (1) और खंड 8 के उप-खंड (1) के साथ पठित, बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970/1980 की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिज़र्व बैंक से परामर्श के पश्चात्, एतद्द्वारा, बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के महाप्रबंधक श्री भूपेन्द्र नय्यर (जन्म तिथि : 13-06-1955) को उनके पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से 30-06-2015 तक, अर्थात् उनके अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने की तारीख तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, ओरियंटल बैंक आफ कामर्स के कार्यपालक निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 4/5/2011-बीओ-I]

विजय मल्होत्रा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th October, 2012

**S.O. 3103.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of Section 9 of the The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970/1980 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 3 and sub-clause (1) of Clause 8 of The Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970/1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri Bhupender Nayyar (DoB : 13-06-1955), General Manager, Bank of India as Executive Director, Oriental Bank of Commerce, with effect from the date of his taking over charge of the post till 30-06-2015, *i.e.* the date of his superannuation or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F.No. 4/5/2011-BO-I]

VIJAY MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

### संचार एवं सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

( डाक विभाग )

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ. 3104.**—राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियमावली, 1965 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के खंड (ख) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा दिनांक 3 फरवरी, 2010 के निदेशालय के आदेश सं. 13-2/2010-पीई. I के जरिए डाक सेवा बोर्ड द्वारा डाक विंग में पोस्टमास्टर संवर्ग की शुरुआत करने के क्रम में, तत्कालीन संचार मंत्रालय ( डाक विभाग ) संख्या का.आ. 2454 दिनांक 27 अगस्त, 1990 के तहत भारत सरकार के आदेश में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करते हैं, नामतः—

उक्त आदेश की अनुसूची में, भाग I तथा II के लिए निम्नलिखित भाग को प्रतिस्थापित किया जाए, नामतः—

“भाग I सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, समूह ‘ख’

पद का विवरण	नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी	शास्ति लागू करने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी	शास्तियां	अपीलीय प्राधिकारी
		और वे शास्तियां जो लागू की जा सकती हैं (नियम 11 में मद संख्याओं के संदर्भ में)		
1	2	3	4	5
(i) वरि. पोस्टमास्टर (समूह ‘ख’ राजपत्रित)	महानिदेशक (डाक)	महानिदेशक (डाक)	सभी	राष्ट्रपति
(ii) पोस्टमास्टर ग्रेड III (समूह ‘ख’ अराजपत्रित)	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं अथवा निदेशक (जनरल पोस्ट ऑफिस)	सभी	सर्किल प्रमुख अथवा क्षेत्रीय पोस्टमास्टर जनरल
		डिवीजन प्रमुख अथवा उप निदेशक (पीओ) अथवा उप मुख्य पोस्टमास्टर अथवा वरिष्ठ पोस्टमास्टर	(i) से (iv)	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं (संबंधित) अथवा निदेशक (जनरल पोस्ट ऑफिस) अथवा मुख्य पोस्टमास्टर
(iii) पोस्टमास्टर ग्रेड-II (समूह ‘ख’ अराजपत्रित)	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं अथवा निदेशक (जनरल पोस्ट ऑफिस)	सभी	सर्किल प्रमुख अथवा क्षेत्रीय पोस्टमास्टर जनरल
		डिवीजन प्रमुख अथवा उप निदेशक (पीओ) अथवा उप मुख्य पोस्टमास्टर अथवा समूह ‘ख’ में वरिष्ठ पोस्टमास्टर	(i) से (iv)	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं अथवा निदेशक (जनरल पोस्ट ऑफिस) अथवा मुख्य पोस्टमास्टर
भाग II सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवाएं, समूह ‘ग’				
(i) पोस्टमास्टर ग्रेड-I (समूह ‘ग’ अराजपत्रित)	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं अथवा निदेशक (जनरल पोस्ट ऑफिस)	सभी	सर्किल प्रमुख अथवा क्षेत्रीय पोस्टमास्टर जनरल
		डिवीजन प्रमुख अथवा उप निदेशक (पीओ) अथवा उप मुख्य पोस्टमास्टर अथवा समूह ‘ख’ में वरिष्ठ पोस्टमास्टर	(i) से (iv)	निदेशक डाक सेवाएं (संबंधित) अथवा निदेशक (जनरल पोस्ट ऑफिस) अथवा मुख्य पोस्टमास्टर

[सं. सी-32016/10/2006-वीपी]

एम. वेंकटेश्वरलू, निदेशक (वीपी एंड डीई)

## MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

### (Department of Posts)

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2012

**S.O. 3104.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule (1) and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeals) Rules, 1965 and in pursuance of introduction of Post-Master Cadre in the Postal Wing by the Postal Service Board vide Directorate's Order No. 13/2/2010-TE-I dated the 3rd February, 2010, the President hereby makes the following amendments in the order of Government of India in the erstwhile Ministry of Communications (Department of Posts) number S.O. 2454 dated the 27th August, 1990, namely—

In the schedule to the said order, for part I & II, the following Part shall be substituted, namely:—

**“PART I GENERAL CENTRAL SERVICES, GROUP “B”**

Description of the Posts	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and the penalties which it may impose, (With reference to item numbers in rule 11)	Penalties	Appellate Authority
1	2	3	4	5
(i) Sr. Postmaster (Group 'B' Gazetted)	Director General (Posts)	Director General (Posts)	All	President
		Head of Circle	(i) to (iv)	Director General (Posts)
(ii) Postmaster Grade III (Group 'B' Non-Gazetted)	Director Postal Services	Director Postal Services or Director (General Post Office)	All	Head of Circle or Regional Postmaster General
		Head of Division or Deputy Director (PO) or Deputy Chief Postmaster or Senior Postmaster	(i) to (iv)	Director Postal Services (Concerned) or Director (General Post Office) or Chief Postmaster
(iii) Postmaster Grade II (Group 'B' Non-Gazetted)	Director Postal Services	Director Postal Services or Director (General Post Office)	All	Head of Circle or Regional Postmaster General
		Head of Division or Deputy Director (PO) or Deputy Chief Postmaster or Senior Postmaster in Group 'B'	(i) to (iv)	Director Postal Services or Director (General Post Office) or Chief Postmaster

**“PART II GENERAL CENTRAL SERVICES, GROUP 'C’”**

(i) Postmaster Grade I (Group 'C' Non-Gazetted)	Director Postal Services	Director Postal Services or Director (General Post Office)	All	Head of Circle or Regional Postmaster General
		Head of Division or Deputy Director (PO) or Deputy Chief Postmaster or Senior Postmaster in Group 'B'	(i) to (iv)	Director Postal Services or Director (General Post Office) or Chief Postmaster

[No. C-32016/10/2006-VP]

M. VENKATESWARLU, Director (VP&DE)

## रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय

(उर्वरक विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3105.—सार्वजनिक परिसर (अनाधिकृत रूप से रहने वालों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे तालिका के कॉलम (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी की उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन हेतु संपदा अधिकारी के रूप में सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के रैंक का समकक्ष अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त तालिका के कॉलम (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सार्वजनिक परिसर के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अंतर्गत संपदा अधिकारियों को दी गई शक्तियों, और कार्यों का निर्वहन करेगा:

## तालिका

अधिकारी का पदनाम	सार्वजनिक परिसरों की श्रेणियां
(1)	(2)
वरिष्ठ प्रणाली अधिकारी/ प्रभारी	हिन्दुस्तान फर्टिलाइजर कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, दुर्गापुर, प्रभाग से संबंधित या अधिगृहीत परिसर
वरिष्ठ प्रणाली अधिकारी/ प्रभारी	हिन्दुस्तान फर्टिलाइजर कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, हल्दिया, प्रभाग से संबंधित या अधिगृहीत परिसर
संयंत्र इंजीनियर (इलेक्ट्र.) प्रभारी	हिन्दुस्तान फर्टिलाइजर कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, बरौनी, प्रभाग से संबंधित या अधिगृहीत परिसर

[फा.सं. 76/01/2012-एच आर-1]

कुलवंत राणा, अवर सचिव (एच.आर. I)

## MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS

(Department of Fertilizers)

New Delhi, the 12th September, 2012

**S.O. 3105.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer of Government to be the Estate Officer for the purpose of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed on Estate Officers by or under the said Act in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table:

TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of the public premises
(1)	(2)
Sr. System Officer/In-charge	Premises belonging to, or taken over by Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Limited, Durgapur, Unit.
Sr. System Officer/In-charge	Premises belonging to, or taken over by Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Limited, Haldia, Division.

(1)

(2)

Plant Engineer(Elect.)  
In-chargePremises belonging to, or  
taken over by Hindustan  
Fertilizer Corporation  
Limited, Barauni, Unit.

[F.No. 76/01/2012-HR-I]

KULWANT RANA, Under Secy. (HR-I)

## सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 2012

का.आ. 3106.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 19-01-2012 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 व 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार केंद्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के दिल्ली सलाहकार पैनल में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हों, सदस्यों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

## क्रम सं. नाम

1. श्री गुरप्रीत सिंह टुटेजा
2. सुश्री गीतांजलि कुमार
3. सुश्री कौसर अहमद
4. सुश्री मीता नाथ
5. श्री संजय निझावन
6. श्री राजकुमार गुप्ता

[फा.सं. 809/3/2011-एफ(सी)]

निरुपमा कोतरू, निदेशक (फिल्म)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND  
BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 10th April, 2012

**S.O. 3106.**—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number dated 19-01-2012 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Delhi Advisory Panel of Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

## S.No. Name

1. Shri Gurpreet Singh Tuteja
2. Ms. Geetanjali Kumar
3. Ms. Kauser Ahmed
4. Ms. Meeta Nath
5. Shri Sanjay Nijhawan
6. Shri Rajkumar Gupta

[F. No. 809/3/2011-F(C)]

NIRUPAMA KOTRU, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 26 अप्रैल, 2012

का.आ. 3107.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 19-01-2012 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुंबई सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य श्री जे॰के॰ जगैसी को तत्काल प्रभाव से एतद्वारा निष्कासित करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/2/2011-एफ(सी)]

निरुपमा कोत्रु, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 26th April, 2012

**S.O. 3107.**—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number dated 19-01-2012 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government hereby removes Shri J.K. Jagaisi as member of Mumbai Advisory Panel of Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect.

[F.No. 809/2/2011-F(C)]

NIRUPAMA KOTRU, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 26 अप्रैल, 2012

का.आ. 3108.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 19-01-2012 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के सलाहकार पैनल सदस्य, सीबीएफसी, बंगलौर में क्रम सं. 42 से सुश्री फ्लोरा सैनी के नाम को एतद्वारा हटाती है क्योंकि उनके नाम का उल्लेख सलाहकार पैनल सदस्य, सीबीएफसी, मुंबई में क्रम सं. 30 में पहले ही कर दिया गया है।

[फा. सं. 809/4/2011-एफ(सी)]

निरुपमा कोत्रु, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 26th April, 2012

**S.O. 3108.**—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number dated 19th Jan. 2012 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government hereby removes the name of Ms. Flora Saini, from Advisory Panel Members, CBFC, Bangalore at S.No. 42 as her name has already been mentioned at S.No. 30, in the Advisory Panel Members, CBFC, Mumbai.

[F.No. 809/4/2011-F(C)]

NIRUPAMA KOTRU, Director (Films)

नई दिल्ली, 28 अगस्त, 2012

का.आ. 3109.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 19-01-2012 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में तथा चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम,

1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुंबई सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्यों के रूप में निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, पैनल के सदस्यों के रूप में नियुक्त करती है :

क्रम सं० नाम

1. श्री विनोद करसनदास दिवेचा
2. श्री आशीष सीजे साह
3. श्री प्रशांत पवार

[फा. सं. 809/2/2011-एफ(सी)]

निरुपमा कोत्रु, निदेशक (फिल्म)

New Delhi, the 28th August, 2012

**S.O. 3109.**—In continuation of Ministry's Notification of even number dated 19-01-2012 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Mumbai Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier :

Sl. No. Name

1. Shri Vinod Karsandas Divecha
2. Shri Ashish CJ Shah
3. Shri Prashant Pawar

[F.No. 809/2/2011-F(C)]

NIRUPAMA KOTRU, Director (Films)

विद्युत मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

का.आ. 3110.—केंद्र सरकार सार्वजनिक स्थल (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी) के अधिकारी श्री जियाउर रहमान, प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन) को भारत सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के समतुल्य पद पर संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है तथा इस प्रयोजन से विद्युत मंत्रालय के दिनांक 8 जून, 1990 के का.आ. संख्या 1760 की भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित अगला संशोधन करती है, अर्थात:-

उक्त अधिसूचना में, तालिका में क्रम सं. 1 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों को निम्नलिखित में प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात:

“1 श्री जियाउर रहमान, प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन), कोरबा सुपर थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), मध्य प्रदेश	नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), कोरबा सुपर थर्मल पावर स्टेशन, कोरबा, जिला-बिलासपुर, मध्य प्रदेश स्थित इसके कार्यालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन अथवा इसके द्वारा पट्टे पर लिए गए सभी संबंधित परिसर।”
--	---

[फा. सं. 8/6/1992-थर्मल-I]

आई.सी.पी. केशरी, संयुक्त सचिव



**टिप्पणी:**— प्रमुख अधिसूचना भारत के राजपत्र में का.आ. संख्या 1760, दिनांक 8 जून, 1990 के द्वारा प्रकाशित की गई थी तथा विगत संशोधन का.आ. संख्या 965, दिनांक 31 मार्च, 2010 के द्वारा किया गया था।

### MINISTRY OF POWER

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3110.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Ziaur Rahman, Manager (Human Resources), an officer of the National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited), equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer of the Government, to be the Estate Officer and for that purpose makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Power number S.O. 1760, dated the 8th June, 1990, namely:—

2. In the said notification in the Table, for serial number 1 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“1. Shri Ziaur Rahman, Manager (Human Resources), Korba Super Thermal Power Project, National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited), Madhya Pradesh.	All premises belonging to, or taken on lease by National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) and under the administrative control of its Korba Super Thermal Power Station, Korba, District Bilaspur, Madhya Pradesh.”
---	---

[F.No. 8/6/1992-TH.-I]

I. C. P. KESHARI, Jt. Secy.

**Note:**— The principal notification was published in the Gazette of India *vide* number S.O. 1760, dated the 8th June, 1990 and last amended *vide* number S.O. 965, dated the 31st March, 2010.

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ.3111.**—केंद्र सरकार सार्वजनिक स्थल (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी) के अधिकारी श्री अनिल कुमार तिवारी, प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन) और श्री शुभ दीप शोम, उप प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन) को भारत सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के समतुल्य पद पर संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है तथा इस प्रयोजन से विद्युत मंत्रालय के दिनांक 8 जुलाई, 1993 के का.आ. संख्या 1590 की भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित अगला संशोधन करती है, अर्थात:—

2. उक्त अधिसूचना में, तालिका में क्रम सं. 5 एवं 6 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों को निम्नलिखित में प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात:—

“5 श्री अनिल कुमार तिवारी, प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन), फिरोज गांधी ऊंचाहार थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), डाकघर-ऊंचाहार, जिला-रायबरेली, उत्तर प्रदेश-229406।	नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), फिरोज गांधी ऊंचाहार थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, डाकघर-ऊंचाहार, जिला-रायबरेली, उत्तर प्रदेश-229406 स्थित इसके कार्यालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन अथवा इसके द्वारा पट्टे पर लिए गए सभी संबंधित परिसर।
6 श्री शुभदीप शोम, उप प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन), नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), सिंगरौली सुपर थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, उत्तर प्रदेश।	नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), सिंगरौली सुपर थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, डाकघर-शक्तिनगर, जिला सोनभद्र, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिन-231222 स्थित इसके कार्यालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन अथवा इसके द्वारा पट्टे पर लिए गए सभी संबंधित परिसर।”

[फा. सं. 8/6/1992-थर्मल-I]

आई.सी.पी. केशरी, संयुक्त सचिव

**टिप्पणी:**— प्रमुख अधिसूचना दिनांक 8 जुलाई, 1993 को का.आ. संख्या 1590 के तहत तथा दिनांक 7 अगस्त, 2009 को का.आ. 2262 के तहत अंतिम संशोधन (फिरोज गांधी ऊंचाहार थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, डाकघर-ऊंचाहार, जिला-रायबरेली, उत्तर प्रदेश-229406 के संबंध में) तथा दिनांक 31 मार्च, 2010 को का.आ. 964 के तहत (सिंगरौली सुपर थर्मल पावर प्रोजेक्ट, उत्तर प्रदेश, पिन-231222 के संबंध में) प्रकाशित हुई।

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3111.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Anil Kumar Tiwari, Manager (Human Resources) and Shri Shubh Deep Shome, Deputy Manager (Human Resources) officers of the National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited), equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer of the Government of India, to be the Estate Officers and for that purpose makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Power number S.O. 1590, dated the 8th July, 1993, namely:—

2. In the said notification, in the Table, for serial numbers 5 and 6 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—



5. Shri Anil Kumar Tiwari, Manager (Human Resources), Feroz Gandhi Unchahar Thermal Power Project, National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited), P.O. Unchahar, District-Raebareli, Uttar Pradesh-229406. All premises belonging to, or taken on lease by the National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) and under the administrative control of its Feroz Gandhi Unchahar Thermal Power Project located at Post Officer, Unchahar, District Raebareli, Uttar Pradesh-229406.
6. Shri Shubh Deep Shome, Deputy Manager (Human Resources), National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited), Singrauli Super Thermal Power Project, Uttar Pradesh. All premises belonging to, or taken on lease by the National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) and under the administrative control of its Singrauli Super Thermal Power Project, P.O. Shakti Nagar, District Sonbhadra, Uttar Pradesh, Pin: 231222."

[F.No. 8/6/1992-TH.-I]  
I.C.P. KESHARI, Jt. Secy.

**Note:**— The principal notification was published *vide* number S.O. 1590, dated the 8th July, 1993 and last amended *vide* number S.O. 2262, dated the 7th August, 2009 (in respect of Feroz Gandhi Unchahar Thermal Power Project, P.O. Unchahar, District-Raebareli, Uttar Pradesh-229406) and *vide* S.O. 964, dated the 31st March, 2010 (in respect of Singrauli Super Thermal Power Project, Uttar Pradesh, Pin: 231222).

नई दिल्ली, 01 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3112.**—केंद्र सरकार सार्वजनिक स्थल (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी) के अधिकारी श्री अरूण कुमार हालदार, प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन) को भारत सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी के समतुल्य पद पर संपदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है तथा इस प्रयोजन से विद्युत मंत्रालय के दिनांक 27 मार्च, 2002 के का.आ. संख्या 1257 की भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित अगला संशोधन करती है, अर्थात:-

2. उक्त अधिसूचना में, तालिका में क्रम सं० 2 एवं उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों को निम्नलिखित से प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात:-

- “2. श्री अरूण कुमार हालदार, प्रबंधक (मानव संसाधन), इंजीनियरिंग ऑफिस कॉम्प्लेक्स, नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), नोएडा।

नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड), विद्युत प्रबंधन संस्थान, प्लॉट नं० 5-14, सेक्टर 16ए, नोएडा-201301 जिला गौतमबुद्ध नगर (उत्तर प्रदेश) स्थित इसके कार्यालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन सभी संबंधित परिसर।

नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड) के कारपोरेट कार्यालय, ईओसी, नोएडा इंजीनियरिंग ऑफिस कॉम्प्लेक्स, प्लॉट नं० ए-8ए, सेक्टर-24, नोएडा-201301 जिला गौतम बुद्ध नगर (उत्तर प्रदेश) स्थित सभी संबंधित परिसर।

नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड) के कारपोरेट सेंटर में, एनएफएल बिल्डिंग, प्लॉट नं० ए-11, एनएफएल परिसर, सेक्टर-24, नोएडा-201301 जिला गौतम बुद्ध नगर (उत्तर प्रदेश) स्थित सभी संबंधित परिसर।

नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड) के एनर्जी टेक्नोलॉजिस, प्लॉट नं० 3, ब्लॉक नं० 3 सेक्टर-इकोटेक-II उद्योग विहार, दुर्गा टाकीज के पीछे, ग्रेटर नोएडा (उत्तर प्रदेश) स्थित सभी संबंधित।

नेशनल थर्मल पावर कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड (एनटीपीसी लिमिटेड) से संबंधित सभी परिसर जो

ए एंड बी टाऊनशिप= ए-71, सेक्टर-33, एनटीपीसी टाऊनशिप, नोएडा (शुभम)

सी एंड डी टाऊनशिप = ए-44, सेक्टर-33, एनटीपीसी टाऊनशिप, नोएडा (समृद्धि)

शौर्य टाऊनशिप=सी-55, सेक्टर-33, एनटीपीसी टाऊनशिप, नोएडा स्थित हैं।”

[फा. सं. 8/6/1992-थर्मल-I]

आई. सी. पी. केशरी, संयुक्त सचिव

**टिप्पणी:-** प्रमुख अधिसूचना भारत के राजपत्र में का.आ. संख्या 1257, दिनांक 27 मार्च, 2002 के द्वारा प्रकाशित की गई थी तथा विगत संशोधन का.आ. संख्या 2259, दिनांक 7 अगस्त, 2009 के द्वारा किया गया था।

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3112.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Arun Kumar Halder, Manager (Human Resources), officer of the National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer of the Government of India and for that purpose makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India, to be the Estate Officer in the Ministry of Power number S.O. 1257, dated 27th March, 2002, namely:—

2. In the said notification, in the Table, for serial number 2 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“2 Shri Arun Kumar Halder, Manager (Human Resources), Engineering Office Complex, National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) NOIDA :

All premises belonging to National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) and under the Administrative Control of its office at Power Management Institute, Plot No.5-14, Sector-16A, NOIDA-201301 District Gautam Budh Nagar (Uttar Pradesh)

All premises belonging to National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) at Corporate Centre, EOC, NOIDA Engineering Office Comple, Plot No.A-8A, Sector-24, NOIDA-201301, District Gautam Budh Nagar (Uttar Pradesh).

All premises belonging to National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) at Corporate Centre, NFL Building, Plot No.A-11, NFL Premises, Sector-24, NOIDA-201301, District Gautam Budh Nagar (Uttar Pradesh).

All premises belonging to National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) at Energy Technologies, Plot No.3, Block No.3, Sector-ECOTECH-II, Udyog Vihar, Behind Durga Talkies, Greater Noida (Uttar Pradesh).

All premises belonging to National Thermal Power Corporation Limited (NTPC Limited) at

A & B Township = A-71, Sector-33, NTPC Township, Noida (Shubham)

C & D Township = A-44, Sector-33, NTPC Township, Noida (Smridhi)

Shaurya Township=C-55, Sector-33, NTPC Township, Noida."

[F.No.8/6/1992-TH.-I]

I. C. P. KESHARI, Jt. Secy.

**Note :** The principal notification was published in the Gazette of India *vide* number S.O. 1257, dated the 27th March, 2002 and last amended *vide* number S.O. 2259, dated the 7th August, 2009.

विदेश मंत्रालय

(सौपीवी प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3113.**—राजनयिक और कौंसलीय ऑफिसर (शपथ और फीस) के अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 41) की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा श्री हिमांशु शेखर झा, ऐपी और डब्ल्यू ओ, को 1 अक्टूबर, 2012 से भारत के राजदूतावास, मास्को में सहायक कौंसलर अधिकारी के कर्तव्यों का पालन करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है ।

[सं.टी. 4330/01/2006]

आर. के. पेरिन्डिया, अवर सचिव (कौंसुलर)

**MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

(CPV DIVISION)

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3113.**—In pursuance of the clause (a) of the Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorize Shri Himanshu Shekhar Jha, AP&WO, Embassy of India Moscow to perform the duties of Assistant Consular Officer with effect from 1st October, 2012.

[No. T. 4330/01/2006]

R.K. PERINDIA, Under Secy. (Consular)

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 4 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3114.**—केन्द्र सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 (यथासंशोधित 1987) के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में, श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय के प्रशासकीय नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालय को, जिसके न्यूनतम 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है :

शाखा कार्यालय, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम, बीकानेर

[सं.ई-11017/1/2006-रा.भा.नी.]

चन्द्र प्रकाश, संयुक्त सचिव

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT**

New Delhi, the 4th October, 2012

**S.O. 3114.**—In pursuance of Sub-Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 (as amended 1987) the Central Government hereby notifies following office under the administrative control of the Ministry of Labour & Employment, at lest 80% Staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :—

Branch Office, Employee's State Insurance Corporation, Bikaner

[No. E-11017/1/2006-RBN]

CHANDRA PRAKASH, Jt. Secy.

**उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय**

उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग

( भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो )

नई दिल्ली, 26 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3115.— भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस भारतीय मानक का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है वह स्थापित हो गया है :-

**अनुसूची**

क्रम संख्या	स्थापित भारतीय मानक (कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
-------------	--	---	--------------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस/आईसीसी 60071-1: 2006 ऊष्मारोधन समन्वयन भाग 1 परिभाषा, सिद्धांत और नियम	आईएस 2165 (भाग 1) : 1977	11.09.2012

इस भारतीय मानक की एक प्रति भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों: नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों: अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ: ईटी 19/टी-24]

आर.सी. मैथ्यू, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

**MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION**

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

(BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS)

New Delhi, the 26th September, 2012

**S.O. 3115.**—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which is given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been issued:

**SCHEDULE**

Sl. No. & year of the No. Indian Standard	No. & Year of the Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Establis-ment
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	IS/IEC 60071-1 : 2006 Insulation coordination Part 1 Definitions, Principles and Rules	IS 2165 (Part 1) : 1977 Insulation coordi-nation Part 1 Phase to Earth Insulation coordination Principles and Rules ( Second Revision )

Copy of this Standard is available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices; Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[ Ref. : ET 19/T-24 ]

R.C. MATHEW, Scientist 'F' &amp; Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

का.आ.3116.— भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गये मानक (कों) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :-

**अनुसूची**

क्रम संख्या	संशोधित भारतीय मानक (कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	संशोधनों की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
-------------	--	----------------------------	--------------------------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस 2418 (भाग 1) : 1977	8 सितम्बर, 2012	30 सितम्बर, 2012

इस भारतीय संशोधन की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों: कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों: अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ: ईटी 23/टी-20]

आर.सी. मैथ्यू, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3116.**—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendment to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been issued :

**SCHEDULE**

Sl. No. & year of the No. the Indian Standards	No. & year of the Amendment	Date from which the Amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	IS 2418 (Part 1) : 1977 Tubular Fluorescent Lamps for General Lighting Service Part 1 Requirements and Tests (First Revision)	8 September, 2012

Copies of this Amendment are available with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneshwar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref.: ET 23/T-20]

R.C. MATHEW, Scientist 'F' & Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 1 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ.3117.**—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए मानक (कों) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :-

#### अनुसूची

क्रम संशोधित भारतीय मानकों संशोधनों की संख्या संशोधन लागू संख्या की संख्या वर्ष और और तिथि होने की तिथि शीर्षक

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस 14665 (भाग 2/ अनुभाग 1) : 2000	3 सितम्बर, 2012	30 सितम्बर, 2012
2.	आईएस 14665 (भाग 3/ अनुभाग 1) : 2000	2 सितम्बर, 2012	30 सितम्बर, 2012
3.	आईएस 15259 : 2002	1 सितम्बर, 2012	30 सितम्बर, 2012

इस भारतीय संशोधन की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों: कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों: अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ: ईटी 25/टी-20, टी-21, टी-22]

आर.सी. मैथ्यू, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 1st October, 2012

**S.O. 3117.**—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the amendment to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been issued:

#### SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards	No & year of the Amendment	Date from which the Amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 14665 (Part 2/Sec 1) : 2000 Electric Transaction Lifts Part 2 Code of Practice for Installation, Operation and Maintenance Section 1 Passenger and Goods Lifts	3 September, 2012	30 September, 2012

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	IS 14665 (Part 3/Sec 1) : 2000 Electric Transaction Lifts Part 3 Safety Rules Section 1 Passenger and Goods Lifts	2 September, 2012	30 September, 2012
3.	IS 15259 : 2002 Installation and maintenance of Hom Lifts-Code of Practice	1 September, 2012	30 September, 2012

Copies of this Amendment are available with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices: Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneshwar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref.: ET 25/T-20, T-21, T-22]

R.C. MATHEW, Scientist 'F' & Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 4 अक्टूबर, 2012

**का.आ. 3118.**—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस भारतीय मानक का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है वह/वे स्थापित हो गए हैं :-

#### अनुसूची

क्रम स्थापित भारतीय मानक (कों) की संख्या स्थापित तिथि नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस/आईसी 62271-207 : 2007 उच्च-वोल्टता के स्विचगियर और नियंत्रणगियर भाग 207, 52 किवा से अधिक की रेटिड वोल्टेज के लिए गैस रोधित स्विचगियर एसेम्बली की भूकम्पीय योग्यता	-	19.07.2012

इस भारतीय मानक की एक प्रति भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों: नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों: अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पुणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[संदर्भ: ईटी 08/टी-40]

आर.सी. मैथ्यू, वैज्ञानिक 'एफ' एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 4th October, 2012

**S.O. 3118.**—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies the



Indian Standards, particulars of which is given in the Schedule hereto annexed has been issued:

### SCHEDULE

Sl. No. & year of the No. Indian Standard	No. & year of the Indian Standards, if any, superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Establishment
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS/IEC 62271-207: 2007 High Voltage Switchgear and Controlgear Part 207 Seismic Qualification for Gas-Insulated Switchgear Assemblies for Rated Voltages above 52 KV	—	19.07.2012

Copy of this Standard is available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices: New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices; Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[Ref.: ET08/T-40]

R.C. MATHEW, Scientist 'F' & Head (Electrotechnical)

### कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 8 अक्टूबर, 2012

का.आ.3119.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी और भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का.आ. 2350, तारीख 29 अगस्त, 2011, जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खण्ड-3, उपखण्ड (ii), की तारीख 28 अगस्त - 3 सितम्बर, 2011 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में, जिसका माप 89.766 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) या 221.811 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विहित उक्त भूमि के भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्त है;

अतः, अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में यथावर्णित 82.116 हेक्टेयर (लगभग) या 202.908 एकड़ (लगभग) माप वाली

भूमि में या उस पर के खनन अधिकार का अर्जन करने की, अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

**टिप्पण 1:** इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक संख्या सी-1(ई)III/एफएफआर/879-0612, तारीख 19 जून, 2012 का निरीक्षण जिला अधिकारी, बैतूल (मध्य प्रदेश) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता-700001 के कार्यालय में या महाप्रबंधक, वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, (राजस्व विभाग), कोल एस्टेट, सिविल लाईन्स, नागपुर-440001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

**टिप्पण 2:** उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध है:-

### अर्जन की बाबत आपत्तियां :-

8(1) कोई व्यक्ति, जो किसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचना जारी की गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के जारी किए जाने के तीस दिनों के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

### स्पष्टीकरण :

(1) किसी व्यक्ति का यह कथन, इस धारा के अर्थान्तर्गत यह आक्षेप नहीं होगा, वह भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए;

(2) धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आक्षेप सक्षम अधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आक्षेपकर्ता को स्वयं चुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसे सभी आक्षेपों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है, वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आक्षेपों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा;

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता, यदि भूमि या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते हैं।

**टिप्पण 3:** केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा कोयला नियंत्रक, 1 काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता-700001 को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग-II, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii), तारीख 11 जून, 1983 में प्रकाशित अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 2519, तारीख 27 मई, 1983 द्वारा सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा नियुक्त किया है।



अनुसूची  
तावा-III अंडरग्राउंड माईन  
पाथाखेड़ा क्षेत्र  
जिला-बैतूल (मध्य प्रदेश)

[रेखांक संख्या सी-1(ई)III/एफएफआर/879-0612, तारीख 19 जून, 2012]

**खनन अधिकार :**

क्रम सं०	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्किट संख्या	कम्पार्टमेंट संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में			टिप्पणी	
						निजी	शासकीय वन	कुल		
1.	भोगई खापा	22	11	घोड़ाडोंगरी	बैतूल	40.820	0.190	0.000	41.010	भाग
2.	गांधीग्राम	78	—	घोड़ाडोंगरी	बैतूल	11.601	3.639	0.000	15.240	भाग
3.	गांधीग्राम	78	174/2 और 11	घोड़ाडोंगरी	बैतूल	0.000	0.000	25.866	25.866	भाग

कुल:- 82.116 हेक्टेयर (लगभग)

या 202.908 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम भोगई खापा में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्यांक :

217 (भाग), सरकारी, 218 (भाग), 219 (भाग), 220/1 (भाग), 221 (भाग), 225 (भाग), 226, 227, 228, 229/1 (भाग), 229/2, 229/3, 229/4, 230/1 (भाग), 230/2, 230/3 (भाग), 230/4, 230/5, 232 (भाग), 233 (भाग), सरकारी, 234 भाग।

ग्राम गांधीग्राम में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्यांक:

11(भाग) वन, 12 सरकारी, 13 (भाग), 15, 17(भाग), 19(भाग), 169 (भाग), 170 सरकारी, 171, 172, 173 सरकारी, 174/1 सरकारी, 174/2 (भाग) वन।

**सीमा वर्णन:**

**क-ख-ग :** रेखा ग्राम भागई खापा एवं ग्राम गांधीग्राम की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा पर बिन्दु 'क' से आरंभ होती है फिर ग्राम गांधीग्राम में वन क्षेत्र से होकर विद्यमान तावा-III की सीमा से लगकर खसरा संख्या 11 (वन) से होकर गुजरती है फिर बिन्दु 'ख' से लगकर गुजरती है और प्लॉट संख्यांक 19, 17 से होकर गुजरती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 15 की बाह्य सीमा से लगकर गुजरती है फिर खसरा संख्या 11 (वन) से होकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।

**ग-घ :** रेखा ग्राम गांधीग्राम में वन क्षेत्र के खसरा संख्या 11 (वन) से होकर गुजरती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 13 से होकर गुजरती है फिर वन क्षेत्र के खसरा संख्या 11 से होकर गुजरती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 169 से होकर गुजरती है फिर वन क्षेत्र में खसरा संख्या 174/2 से होकर गुजरती है फिर रेखा खसरा संख्या 170 (सरकारी) से होकर गुजरती है फिर वन क्षेत्र के खसरा संख्या 174/2 से होकर गुजरती है और ग्राम गांधीग्राम एवं ग्राम भोगई खापा की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा पर बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।

**घ-ङ :** रेखा ग्राम गांधीग्राम एवं भोगई खापा की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा से लगकर गुजरती है और बिन्दु 'ङ' पर मिलती है।

**ङ-च-छ-क :** रेखा ग्राम भोगई खापा में प्लॉट संख्यांक 229/1, 232, 230/3, 230/1, 217 (सरकारी), 218 से होकर गुजरती है फिर बिन्दु 'च' के पास से लगकर गुजरती

है फिर प्लॉट संख्यांक 219, 220/1, 221 से होकर गुजरती है फिर बिन्दु 'छ' के पास से लगकर गुजरती है फिर प्लॉट संख्या 225 से होकर गुजरती है और आरंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[फा.सं. 43015/4/2011-पीआरआईडब्ल्यू-I]

ए. के. दास, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF COAL**

New Delhi, the 8th October, 2012

**S.O. 3119.**—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal vide number S.O. 2350, dated the 29th August, 2011, issued under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the August 28th to 3rd September, 2011, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 89.766 hectares (approximately) or 221.811 acres (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of said lands prescribed in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire mining rights in or over the land measuring 82.116 hectares (approximately) or 202.908 acres (approximately) as described in the Schedule appended hereto.

**Note 1:** The plan bearing number C-1(E) III/FFR/879-0612, dated the 19th June, 2012 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected at the office of the Collector, Betul (Madhya Pradesh) or at the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata (Pin-700001) or at the office of the General Manager, Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Department), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur-440001 (Maharashtra).

**Note 2:** Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of Section 8 of the said Act which provides as follows:—

**Objections to Acquisition:**

8(1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under sub-section (1) of Section 7 has been issued, may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

**Explanation :**

(1) It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) of Section 8 shall be made to the Competent Authority in writing, and the Competent Authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further inquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act.

**Note 3 :** The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata-700001 has been appointed by the Central Government as the Competent Authority under section 3 of the said Act, *vide* notification number S.O. 2519, dated the 27th May, 1983, published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, section 3, sub-section (ii), dated the 11th June, 1983.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Bhogai Khapa : 217(P) Govt., 218(P), 219(P), 220/1(P), 221(P), 225(P), 226, 227, 228, 229/1(P), 229/2, 229/3, 229/4, 230/1(P), 230/2, 230/3(P), 230/4, 230/5, 232(P), 233(P) Govt., 234(P).

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Gandhigram :

11(P) Forest, 12 Govt., 13(P), 15, 17(P), 19(P), 169(P), 170 Govt., 171, 172, 173 Govt., 174/1 Govt., 174/2(P) Forest.

**Boundary description :**

A-B-C: Line starts from Point "A" on common village boundary of villages Bhogai Khapa and Gandhigram, then passes in village Gandhigram along the Existing Tawa-III Mine boundary through forest area's Khasra No. 11 (Forest), then passes nearby Point "B" and passes through plot numbers 19, 17 then passes along the outer boundary of plot number 15 then passes through Khasra number 11 (Forest) and meets at Point 'C'.

C-D: Line passes in Gandhigram through Khasra No. 11 of forest area then passes through plot number 13, then passes through Khasra number 11 of forest area, then passes through plot number 169, then passes through Khasra number 174/2 of forest area, then passes through Khasra number 170(Govt.), then passes through Khasra No. 174/2 of forest area and meets at Point 'D' on common village boundary of villages Gandhigram and Bhogai Khapa.

D-E: Line passes along with the common village boundary of villages Gandhigram and Bhogai Khapa and meets at Point 'E'.

E-F-G-A: Line passes in village Bhogai Khapa through plot number 229/1, 232, 230/3, 230/1, 217 (Govt.), 218, then passes nearby Point 'F', then passes

**SCHEDULE**

**TAWA-III UNDERGROUND MINE  
PATHAKHERA AREA**

**DISTRICT-BETUL (MADHYA PRADESH)**

(Plan bearing number C-1(E)III/FFR/879-0612, dated the 19th June, 2012)

**MINING RIGHTS:**

Sl. No.	Name of village	Patwari Circle number	Compartiment number	Tahsil	District	Ten.	Area in Hectares			Remarks
							Government Forest		Total	
1	Bhogai Khapa	22	—	Ghoradongri	Betul	40.820	0.190	0.000	41.010	Part
2.	Gandhigram	78	—	Ghoradongri	Betul	11.601	3.639	0.000	15.240	Part
3	Gandhigram	78	174/2 and 11	Ghoradongri	Betul	0.000	0.000	25.866	25.866	Part

**Total :** 82.116 hectares (approximately)  
or 202.908 acres (approximately)

through plot numbers 219, 220/1, 221, then passes nearby Point “G”, then passes through plot number 225 and meets at starting Point ‘A’.

[F.No. 43015/4/2011-PRIW-I]

A.K. DAS, Under Secy.

**श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ.3120.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेक्रेटरी, दिल्ली डवलपमेंट अथॉरिटी, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-1 नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 147/2011) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-42011/32/2007-आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र कुमार, अनुभाग अधिकारी

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT**

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2012

**S.O. 3120.**—in pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 147/2011) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No-1, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the Secretary, Delhi Development Authority, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-09-2012.

[No.L-42011/32/2007-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA KUMAR, Section Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE DR. R.K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.1, KARKARDOOMA COURTS COMPLEX, DELHI**

**I.D. NO. 147/2011**

Shri Ramesh Chand,  
S/o Sh. Jagan Ram through  
Delhi Labour Union,  
Aggarwal Bhawan,  
GT. Karnal Road, Tis Hazari  
Delhi-110054

...Workman

Versus

The Secretary,  
Delhi Development Authority,  
Vikas Sadan, I.N.A. Market,  
Delhi

...Management

**AWARD**

A Gardner was appointed by Delhi Development Authority “in short the Authority” on 01-10-1975 as muster

roll worker. From 18-10-1976, he was taken as work charge employee. Since 1978, work of Lower Divisional Clerk is taken from the said gardner. He claims that wages of a clerk may be paid to him. When his request was declined by the Authority, he raised an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer. His claim was resisted by the Authority, hence conciliation proceedings ended in failure. On consideration of his failure report, submitted by the Conciliation Officer, appropriate Government referred the dispute to Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, New Delhi, for adjudication, vide order No. L-42011/32/2007-IR(DU), New Delhi dated 28-06-2007, with the following terms :—

“Whether the demand of Delhi Labour Union for grant of. pay scale of Lower Divisional Clerk to Shri Ramesh Chand is legal and justified? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. Claim statement was filed by the Gardner, namely Shri Ramesh Chand pleading therein that he joined services of the Authority on 01-10-1975 as muster roll employee. From 18-10-1976, he was taken as work charge employee. In 1978, job of Lower Divisional Clerk was assigned to him, since there, was shortage of employees in that category. He was eligible and qualified for the job of a Clerk. Since then, he is continuously performing job of a Clerk efficiently. However, the Authority is paying him wages as that a gardner. He is discharging duties of a Clerk, which are of permanent in nature. Payment of wages of the post of gardner is violative of the provisions of Articles 14, 16 and 39(d) of the Constitution. Acts of the Authority amounts to exploitation and unfair labour practice. He claims that the Authority may be directed to regularize his services on the post of Lower Divisional Clerk and to pay him wages of that post with retrospective effect. He also claims that post of litigation may also be awarded in his favour.

3. Claim was demurred by the Authority pleading that he was appointed as a gardner with effect from 01-10-1975 on muster roll and was taken as work charge employee with effect from 18-10-1976. It has been disputed that the claimant is performing the job of a Lower Divisional Clerk. The Authority asserts the he never worked as a Clerk. There is no provision to promote a gardner to the post of a Clerk, since there are distinct provisions for selection to the post of a Clerk. It has been prayed that his claim may be discarded, being devoid of merits.

4. In rejoinder, the claimant reiterates facts pleaded by him in his claim statement.

5. None appeared on behalf of the Authority since 16-12-2008. Considering those facts, the Authority was proceeded ex-parte, vide order dated 06-01-2011.

6. Vide order No.Z-22019/6-IR(C-II) New Delhi dated 30-3-2011, the appropriate Government transferred the case to this Tribunal for adjudication.

7. The claimant tendered his affidavit as evidence. No other witness was brought forward on his behalf to testify facts.

8. Arguments were heard at the bar. Shri Surender Bhardwaj, authorized representative, advanced arguments on behalf of the claimant. As the Authority was proceeded ex-parte, none came forward to raise submissions on its behalf. I have given my careful considerations to the arguments advanced at the bar and cautiously perused the record. My findings on the issues involved in the controversy are as follows:

9. Claimant swears in his affidavit dated 16-06-2011, tendered as evidence, that he joined services of the Authority as “mali” with effect from 01-10-1975 on muster roll. He was taken as work charge employee with effect from 18-10-1976. In 1978, he was assigned the job of Lower Divisional Clerk, since there was shortage of Clerks with the Authority. He was eligible and qualified for that job. He is continuously performing duties of Lower Divisional Clerk efficiently and punctually. Though he is discharging duties of Lower Divisional Clerk, yet he is being paid wages as that of a “mali” only. The Authority should have regularized his services but no steps are taken in that regard. Non-regularisation of his services as Lower Divisional Clerk with retrospective effect is illegal, unjust and mala fide. He is working against a vacant post of Lower Divisional Clerk. The Authority is bound to give him status of Clerk, since he is working on that post. He served notice of demand dated 14-05-2005 on the Authority. Copies of office orders dated 16-12-1981, 17-06-1987, 28-04-2003 and 08-12-2004 espouse his claim. Written statement submitted by the Authority before the Conciliation Officer also gives reaffirmation to above facts.

10. Out of facts detailed by the claimant in his affidavit, it came to light that he joined as “mali” with the Authority on 01-10-1975 on muster roll. On 18-10-1976, he was taken as work charge employee. Office orders dated 16-12-1981, 28-04-2003 and 08-12-2004 bring it to the light of the day that the claimant is working on the post of Lower Divisional Clerk with the Authority since 1978. In its written statement filed before the Conciliation Officer, the Authority projects that the claimant made a request to be permitted to work in the office in clerical job instead of sending him to field to work as “mali”. On humanitarian grounds, his request was allowed. He was permitted to perform clerical jobs instead of doing duties as “mali” in the field. However, it has been asserted by the Authority that clerical posts are filled by way of selection. Claimant had not passed any

selection process for his appointment on clerical post. It would be a back door entry on clerical post in case his claim is allowed, asserted the Authority.

11. Equality before law and equal protection of laws are fundamental rights of every person, ordains Article 14 of the Constitution. The guiding principles laid in Article 14 are that persons, who are similarly situated, shall be treated alike both in privileges conferred and liability imposed, which means that amongst equals. The law should be equal and should be equally administered and that like should be treated alike. Article 16 of the Constitution guarantees equality of opportunities for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State. What is guaranteed is the equality of opportunity. Like all other employers, government is also entitled to pick and choose from amongst a large number of candidates offering themselves for employment. But the selection process must not be arbitrary. The guarantee given by clause (a) of Article 16 of the Constitution will cover (a) initial appointments, (b) promotions, (c) termination of employment, (d) and matters relating to salary, periodical increments, leaves, gratuity, pension, age of superannuation etc. Matters relating to employment or appointments include all matters in relations to employment both prior and subsequent to the employment which are incidental to the employment and form part of the terms and conditions of such employment.

12. Fundamental rights guaranteed by Article 14 forbids class legislation, but does not forbid classification or differentiation which rests upon reasonable ground of discretion. Classification is the recognition of the relations, and in making it the Government must be allowed a wide latitude of discretion and judgment. In a way, the consequences of such classification would undoubtedly be to differentiate persons belonging to that class from others. The classification must be founded on an intelligible differentia which distinguishes persons or things that are grouped together from others left out of the group and the differentia must have a rational relation to the object sought to be achieved. Classification may be made according to the nature of persons, nature of business, and may be based with reference to time.

13. Concept of equality guaranteed by Article 16 of the Constitution is something more than formal equality and enables the under privileged groups to have a fair share by having more than equal chance and enables the State to give favoured treatment to those groups by achieving real equality with reference to social needs.



'Protection discrimination' enabled the State to adopt new strategy to bring under privileged at par with the rest of the society, by providing all possible opportunities and incentives to them. Therefore a class may be allowed to have preferential treatment in the matter relating to employment or appointment. There cannot be rule of equality between members of separate and independent group of persons. Persons can be classified in different groups, based on in terms of nature of persons, nature of business and with reference to time.

14. Now it would be considered as to whether the claimant is entitled for wages for the post of Lower Divisional Clerk, on which he is working since 1978. Doctrine of "equal pay for equal work" has been enshrined under Article 39(d) of the Constitution as one of the directive principles of the State policy, requiring the State to secure "equal pay for equal work" for both, men and women. This constitutional goal is capable of attainment through constitutional remedies by way of enforcement of constitutional rights, declares the Supreme Court in *Randhir Singh* [1982 (1) LLJ 344]. In *G. Sreenivasa Rao* [1989(2) LLJ 149], the Apex Court announced that right to "equal pay for equal work" is an accompaniment of the equality clause enshrined in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. Nevertheless, abstract doctrine of "equal pay for equal work" cannot be read in Article 14. Reasonable classification, based on intelligible criteria having nexus with the object sought to be achieved, is permissible.

15. In *Grih Kalyan Kendra Workers Union* [1991 (1) LLJ 349] Apex Court had gone to the extent of saying that "equal pay, for equal work" has assumed the status of fundamental right in service jurisprudence having regard to the constitutional mandate of equality in Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. It was pronounced therein that it has ceased to be a judge made law as it is the part of the constitutional philosophy which ensures a welfare socialistic pattern of State providing equal opportunity to all and equal pay for equal work for similarly placed employees of the State. The Principles does not apply to the State only but also applies to the State instrumentalities.

16. In 1976, Equal Remuneration Act, 1976 was enacted to implement provisions of Article 39(d) of the Constitution. Construing provisions of that Act, Supreme Court in *Audrey D'Costa* [1987(1) LLJ 536] pronounced that the Act does not permit the management to pay to a section of its employees, doing the same work or work similar in nature, lower pay contrary to the provisions of Section 4(1) of the Act only because it is not able to pay equal remuneration to the all.

The Court further observed that the applicability of the Act does not depend upon the financial ability of the management to pay equal remuneration as provided by it.

17. In deciding whether the work is the same or is broadly the same, the Authority should take a broad view and also adopt a broad approach in ascertaining whether any differences are of practical importance because from the subject of 'similar work' implies difference in detail. Actual duties performed should be looked into and not those that are theoretically possible. Elaborating the concept of "equal pay for equal work" and its application, the Apex Court in *Randhir Singh* (Supra) observes as follows:—

"Where all things are equal that is, where all relevant considerations are the same, persons holding identical posts may not be treated differentially in the matter of their pay merely because they belong to different departments. Of course, if officers of the same rank perform dissimilar functions and the powers, duties and responsibilities of the posts held by them vary, such officers may not be heard to complain of dissimilar pay merely because the posts are of the same rank and the nomenclature is the same \*\*\* and there are different grades in a service, with varying qualifications for entry into a particular grade, the higher grade often being a promotional avenue for officers of the lower grade. The higher qualification for higher grade, which may be either academic qualification or experience based on length of service, reasonably sustain the classification of the officers into two grades with different scales of pay. The principle of "equal pay for equal work" would be an abstract doctrine not attracting Article 14 if sought to be applied to them".

18. In *Delhi Veterinary Association* (AIR 1984 SC 1221), the Supreme Court ruled that apart from the nature of work, the pay structure should reflect many other values and observed that the employer should follow certain basic principles in fixing the pay scales of various posts and cadres in the Government service. The degree of skill, strain of work, experience involved, training required, responsibility undertaken, mental and physical requirements, disagreeableness of the task, hazard attendant on work and fatigue involved are, according to the Third Pay Commission, some of the relevant factors which should be taken into consideration in fixing pay scales. The method of recruitment, the level at which the initial recruitment is made in the hierarchy of service or cadre, minimum educational and technical qualifications prescribed for the post, the nature of dealings with the public, avenues of promotion available and horizontal and vertical relativity with other jobs in the same service or outside are also relevant factors, announced the Court.

19. In *J.P. Chaurasia* [1989 (1) LLJ 309], the Apex Court, elaborating the same theme, ruled that apart from the nature of work or volume of the work done the other relevant factors to be taken into account, are 'evaluation of duties and responsibilities of the respective posts'. In *Hari Narain Bhowal* [1995 (II) LLJ 328], the Apex Court pronounced



that the principle of “equal pay for equal work” can be enforced when claiming persons satisfy the Court that not only the nature of work is identical but in all other respects they belong to the same class and there is no apparent reason to treat “equals as unequals”.

20. In *Ram Ashray Yadav* [1996 (II) LLJ 92], the Apex Court observed that principle of “equal pay for equal work” will not apply where qualification prescribed, mode of recruitment and the nature of duties are different for regular employees and a temporary employee. The claim of temporary Investigator-cum-Computer for payment of salary at par with the regular Investigator-cum-Computer was discarded by the Court in the said case. However classification of officers into two groups, namely, deputation's and non-deputation's, for paying different rates of special pay was held to be not permissible under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution, as it did not bear any rational relation to the objects of the classification. See *M.P. Singh* (A.I.R. 1987 S.C. 485).

21. In *Surjit Singh* [2009(123) FLR 38] Apex Court was confronted with the proposition as to whether the persons employed as daily wagers in different capacities by Public Health Department of State of Punjab were entitled for “equal pay for equal work” to that of the employees who were appointed against regular posts, by following process of recruitment. It was ruled therein that grant of benefit of doctrine of “equal pay for equal work” depends upon a large number of factors, including equal work, equal value, source and manner of appointment, equal identify of group and whole sale or complete identity with the employee with whom equality is claimed. The same threads of thoughts were there in *Ramesh Chandra Bajpai* [2009(123) FLR 525] wherein the Apex Court ruled that similarity in the designation or nature or quantum of work is not determinative of equality in the matter of pay scales. It was emphasized that the Court has to consider the factors like the source and mode of recruitment/appointment, qualifications, the nature of work, the value thereof, responsibilities, reliability, experience, confidentiality, functional need, etc. In other words, the equality clause can be invoked in the matter of pay scales only when there is whole sale identity between the holders of two posts.

22. Relying on above law, it would be considered as to whether there is complete and whole sale identify between the claimant and a Lower Divisional Clerk, recruited by the Authority following recruitment process. Answer lies in the negative. Claimant was engaged as a “mali” on muster roll. Subsequently, he was taken as work charge employee. In 1978 the Authority started taking job of clerk from him. In case he makes a lapse in performance of that job, the authorities cannot hold him accountable, since he is not a holder of that post. The claimant is immune from rigours of disciplinary action and responsibility. On the other hand, his engagement is on the post of “mali”. Thus,

it is evident that the claimant does not have any identity not to talk of wholesale identity with a clerk, who has been engaged following recruitment process. Responsibility assigned to the claimant cannot be said to be of equal value with that of holder of post of clerk on permanent basis. Mere factor that the work of the clerk was taken would not put him at par with a clerk appointed, following proper recruitment process. Educational qualification, experience, method of recruitment and promotion to different categories of posts of clerk nowhere tallies with the factors applicable to the claimant. Hence, it cannot be said that the claimant is in complete and wholesale identity with a clerk regularly appointed by the Authority. In such a situation the claimant cannot invoke the doctrine of “equal pay for equal work”. The Authority has not committed any illegality when wages of a clerk, appointed by following recruitment rules, are not paid to him.

23. For consideration of aspects of social justice, the Tribunal has to keep in mind that the Act is a beneficiary legislation calculated to ensure social justice to both employers and employees and advance progress of industry by brining harmony and cordial relationship between the parties. The Act empowers adjudicating authorities to abrogate conditions in contract of employment, in the interest of social justice. Social and economic justice is ultimate ideal of industrial adjudication. Social and economic justice has been given place of pride in our Constitution and doctrine of absolute freedom of contract has thus to yield to the higher claims for social justice. See *Raibahadur Deewan Badri Das* [1962 (II) LLJ 366].

24. Social justice is not based on contractual relations and is not to be enforced on principles of contract of service. It is something outside these principles and invoked to do justice without a contract to back out. Reference can be made to precedent in *Rashtriya Mill Mazdoor Sangh* [1960 (II) LLJ 263]. In *J.K. Cotton Spinning & Weaving Mills Company Ltd.* [1963 (II) LLJ 435] the Apex Court ruled that industrial disputes are to be adjudicated laced with the concept of social justice. It would be expedient to reproduce the observations made by the Apex Court which are extracted thus:

"In our opinion the argument that the considerations of social justice are irrelevant and untenable in dealing with industrial disputes, has to be rejected without any hesitation. The development of industrial law during the last decade and several decisions of this court in dealing with industrial matters have emphasized the relevance, validity and significance of doctrine of social justice.... Indeed the concept of social justice has now become such an integral part of industrial law that it would be idle for any party to suggest that industrial adjudication can or should ignore the claim of social justice in dealing with industrial disputes. The concept of social justice is not

narrow or one sided, or pedantic, and is not confined to industrial adjudication alone. Its sweep is comprehensive. It is founded on the basic idea of socio economic equality and its aim is to assist the removal of socio economic disparities and inequalities".

25. In Ahmedabad Manufacturing and Calico Printing Company Ltd. [1972 (II) LLJ 165] the above principles were reiterated by the Apex Court. Therefore, the law laid down by Apex Court makes it clear that the industrial adjudication cannot and should not ignore the claims of social justice. Same views were expressed in Basti Sagar Mills Company Ltd. [1978 (II) LLJ 412]. Therefore this Tribunal has to consider the case on the touch stone of social justice also.

26. Claimant nowhere presents that work of a clerk was taken from him, by way of command from the side of the Authority. He had not shown any document to this effect that he has not offered himself to render clerical job with the Authority. On the other hand, "mali" had to perform menial jobs in field. Clerk has to sit in the office and thus evades rigors of weather and climate, while being in field. It is apparent that the claimant opted to perform the work of clerk voluntarily. Office order dated 08-12-2004 projects that honorarium was being sanctioned by the Authority for sitting late in office, in exigency. In such a situation, I do not find it to be a case of commanding the Authority to grant him wages of a clerk, even on social justice considerations. In view of these reasons, it is clear that the claimant failed to project that the doctrine of equal pay for equal work is applicable to him. His claim has no merits. The same is, accordingly, dismissed. An award is passed in favour of the Authority and against the claimant. It be sent to the appropriate Government for publication.

Dr. R.K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

Dated : 6-8-2012

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3121.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मेडीकल सुपरिन्टेन्डेन्ट, सफदरजंग हास्टिल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 212/2011) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/170/1996-आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र कुमार, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2012

**S.O. 3121.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby published the Award (Ref. No. 212/2011) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No-1, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the Medical Superintendent, Safdarjung

Hospital and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-09-2012.

[No. L-42012/170/1996-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA KUMAR, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R.K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
NO. 1, KARKARDOOMA COURTS COMPLEX, DELHI**

**I.D. No. 212/2011**

Shri Daljeet Singh

S/o Sh. Swaroop Singh Bhandari,

R/o H.No. 28, Aliganj,

Kotla Mubarakpur,

New Delhi.

... Workman

#### Versus

The Medical Superintendent,

Safdarjung Hospital,

New Delhi.

... Management

#### AWARD

Shri Sarup Singh, Chowkidar, working with Safdarjang Hospital, New Delhi, (in short the Hospital) died in harness. His son, namely, Daljeet Singh was appointed to the post of Stretcher Bearer on compassionate grounds. He joined his services on 31-8-1990. He served the Hospital till 31-1-1995, the date when his services were dispensed with under Rule 5 of the Central Civil Services (Temporary Services) Rules, 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the Rules). He raised a demand with the Hospital for reinstatement of his services, which demand was not conceded to. Thereafter he raised an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer. As the Hospital was not ready to take him back on job, conciliation proceedings failed. On consideration of the failure report, submitted by the Conciliation Officer, the appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, vide order No. L-42012/170/96-IR (DU), New Delhi, dated 8-10-1997, with following terms:—

"Whether action of the Management of Safdarjang Hospital in terminating the services of Shri Daljeet Singh, Stretcher Bearer w.e.f. 18-2-1995 is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled and from what date".

2. Claim statement was filed by Shri Daljeet Singh pleading therein that he was employed as a Stretcher Bearer with the Hospital on 28-8-1990. He rendered continuous service till 31-1-1995. His services were terminated under rule 5 of the Rules by giving one month's notice to him. Action of the Hospital tantamounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act). The Hospital

had not complied with the mandatory provisions of Section 25F of the Act, hence its action of terminating services of the claimant is illegal and non est, the Hospital is an industry within the meaning of Section 2(j) of the Act and the Hospital could not terminate services of the claimant without following the provisions of the Act. He raised a demand vide letter dated 1-3-1995 seeking reinstatement of his services, which demand was not conceded to. Legal notice dated 3-4-1995 was also sent but to no avail. He claims that the impugned order of termination of his services may be held to be illegal and he may be reinstated in services of the Hospital with continuity and full back wages.

3. Claim was demurred by the Hospital pleading that the claimant was offered a temporary post of Stretcher Bearer vide letter dated 28-8-1990. The claimant accepted terms and conditions contained in that letter and joined his duties on 31-8-1990. His services were terminated by the Disciplinary Authority, vide office order dated 31-1-1995 after complying with the prescribed procedure laid down in the Rules. One month's notice was given to the claimant and thereafter his services were dispensed with. Since claimant was covered under the Rules he cannot avail benefit of the Act. His services were dispensed with for gross misconduct of unauthorized absence. Thereafter his applications dated 17-2-1995 and 1-3-1995 asking for reinstatement of his services were carefully considered but were not found to be acceptable. The Hospital claims that relief of reinstatement is not available to the claimant and his claim may be dismissed.

4. In rejoinder the claimant reiterates facts pleaded in the claim statement.

5. It would not be out of place to mention that an award dated 4-7-2000 was passed by the Tribunal, concluding therein that the claimant was entitled for reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages. The award, so passed, was assailed by the Hospital before High Court of Delhi. Vide judgement dated 12-4-2005, the award was set aside and the matter was remanded back to this Tribunal for adjudication afresh, after affording an opportunity of being heard to the Hospital.

6. Claimant has examined himself in support of his claim. Dr. Sudhir Chandra entered the witness box and testified facts on behalf of the Hospital.

7. Vide order No. Z-22019/6/2007/IR (C-II) New Delhi, dated 11-2-2008 the appropriate Government transferred the case to Central Government Industrial Tribunal II, New Delhi, for adjudication. It was retransferred to this Tribunal by the appropriate Government, vide order No. Z-22019/6/2007/IR (C-II) dated 30-3-2001, for adjudication.

8. Arguments were heard at the bar, Shri L.S. Gautam, authorized representative, advanced arguments on behalf of the claimant. Shri Neeraj Tiwari, authorized

representative, presented facts on behalf of the Hospital. Written submissions were also filed by the parties. I have given my careful considerations to the arguments advanced at the bar and cautiously perused the record. My findings on issues involved in the controversy are as follows:—

9. At the outset a legal issue was raised by Shri Tiwari pleading that the Hospital is not an industry within the meaning of Section 2(j) of the Act. It has been claimed that such an issue was addressed to by the Apex Court in *Kuldip Singh Sethi* [1970 (1) SCC 735] wherein it was concluded that the Hospital was not an Industry. Contra to it Shri Gautam agitates that law has gone sea change and it does not lie in the mouth of the Hospital to claim that it is not an industry. Consequently it became expedient to know as to whether the Hospital is an industry or not. For an answer, the definition of “industry” as enacted by clause (j) of Section 2 of the Act is to be considered. Definition of the word “industry” enacted in the aforesaid clause is reproduced thus :

“Industry” means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers and includes any calling, services, employment, handicraft, or industrial occupation or avocation of workmen.

10. The definition of “industry” is both exhaustive and inclusive. It is in two parts. The first part says that it “means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers” and then goes to say that it “includes any calling, service, employment, handicraft or industrial occupation or avocation of workmen.” Thus one part defined it from the stand point of the employer, and the other part from the stand point of the employees. The first part of the definition gives the statutory meaning of the industry, whereas the second part deliberately refers to several other items of industry and bring them in the definition in an inclusive way. The first part of the definition determines any industry by reference to occupation of employers in respect of certain activities viz., business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling. The second part views the matter from the angle of employees and is designed to include something more in what the term primarily denotes. By this part of the definition any calling, employment, handicraft, industrial occupation or avocation of workmen is included in the concept of industry. This part gives extended connotation.

11. Gloss was put on the definition of word “industry” by the High Courts and the Apex Court time and again. The question as to what is “industry” has continuously baffled and perplexed the courts. A graph of the cases decided by the Apex Court, if plotted on the background of the expression used in two parts of the definition of “industry”, would represent rather a zig zag curve. There have been various judicial ventures in this rather volatile area of law. The decided cases show that the efforts were made to evolve test by reference to characteristics regarded as essential for constituting an activity as an “industry”,

Various cases would show that the Apex Court have been guided more by empirical rather than a strictly analytical approach. Most of the decision have centered around the expression “undertaking” used in the definition. In Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (1978 Lab. I.C. 778) the Apex Court reviewed the earlier decisions on interpretation of the wide words encompassed in the definition and formulated positive and negative principles for identifying “industry”, as enacted by clause (j) of Section 2 of the Act. It would be expedient to reproduce the authoritative pronouncement of the Court, in the very words set out in the majority decision, handed down by Justice Krishna Iyer, which are extracted thus :

I. “industry” as defined in S. 2(j)- and explained in Banerji (AIR 1953 S.C. 58) has a wide import.

- (a) Where (i) systematic activity, (ii) organized by co-operation between employer and employee (the direct and substantial element is chimerical), (iii) for the production and/or distribution of goods and services calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes (not spiritual or religious but inclusive of material things or services geared to celestial bliss i.e. making, on a large scale prasada or foods) prima facie, there is an “industry” in that enterprise.
- (b) Absence of profit motive or gainful objective is irrelevant, be the venture in the public, joint, private or other sector.
- (c) The true focus is functional and the decisive test is the nature of the activity with special emphasis on the employer-employee relations.
- (d) If the organization is a trade or business it does not cease to be one because of philanthropy animating the undertaking.

II. Although Section 2 (j) uses words of the widest amplitude in its two limbs, the re-meaning cannot be magnified to overreach itself.

- (a) “Undertaking” must suffer a contextual and associational shrinkage as explained in Banerjee and in this judgment, so also, service, calling and the like. This yields the inference that all organized activity possessing the triple elements in I (supra), although not trade or business, may still be “industry” provided the nature of activity, viz., the employer-employee basis, bears resemblance to what we find in trade or business. This takes into the fold “industry” undertaking, calling and services, adventures, “analogous to the carrying on the trade or business”. All features, other than the methodology of carrying on the activity viz. in organizing the co-operation between employer and employee, may be dissimilar. It does not matter, if on the employment terms there is analogy.

III. Application of these guidelines should not short of their logical reach by invocation of creeds, cults or inner sense of incongruity or outer sense of motivation for or resultant of the economic operations. The ideology of the Act being industrial peace, regulation and resolution of industrial disputes between employer and workmen, the range of their statutory ideology must inform the reach of the statutory definition. Nothing less, nothing more.

- (a) The consequences are (i) professions, (ii) clubs, (iii) education institutions, (iv) co-operatives, (v) research institutes, (vi) charitable projects and (vii) other kindred adventures, if they fulfil the triple tests listed in 1 (supra), cannot be exempted from the scope of Section 2(j).
- (b) A restricted category of professions, clubs, co-operatives and even durukulas and little research labs may qualify for exemption if in simple ventures, substantially, and going by the dominant nature criterion, substantively no employees are entertained but in menial matters, marginal employees are hired without destroying the non-employee character of the unit.
- (c) If, in a pious or altruistic mission many employ themselves, free or for small honoraria or like return, mainly drawn by sharing in the purpose or cause, such as lawyers volunteering to run a free legal services clinic or doctors serving in their spare hours in a free medical centre or ashramites working at the bidding of the holiness, divinity or like central personality, and the services are supplied free or at nominal cost and those who serve are not engaged for remuneration or on the basis of master and servant relationship, then, the institution is not an industry even if stray servants, manual or technical, are hired. Such eleemosynary or like undertakings alone are exempt not other generosity, compassion, developmental passion or project.

IV. The dominant nature test:

- (a) Where a complex of activities, some of which qualify for exemption, other not, involves employees on the total undertaking, some of whom are not “workmen” as in the University of Delhi case (AIR 1963 S.C. 1873) or some departments are not productive of goods and services if isolated, even then, the predominant nature of the services and the integrated nature of the departments as explained in the Corporation of Nagpur (AIR 1960 SC 675) will be the true test. The whole undertaking will be industry although those who are not “workmen” by definition may not benefit by the status.



- (b) Notwithstanding the previous clauses, sovereign functions, strictly understood (alone) qualify for exemption, not the welfare activities or economic adventures undertaken by Government or statutory bodies.
  - (c) Even in department discharging sovereign functions, if there are units which are industries and they are substantially severable, then they can be considered to come within S. 2(j).
  - (d) Constitutional and competently enacted legislative provisions may remove from the scope of the Act categories which otherwise may be covered thereby.
- V. We overrule *Safdarjung* (AIR 1970 SC 1407), *Solicitors' case* (AIR 1962 SC 1080), *Gymkhana* (AIR 1968 SC 554), *Delhi University* (AIR 1963 SC 1873), *Dhanrajgirji Hospital* (AIR 1975 SC 2032) and other rulings whose ratio runs counter to the principles enunciated above, and the *Hospital Mazdoor Sabha* (AIR 1960 SC 610) is hereby rehabilitated."

12. The Hospital attempts to place reliance on a precedent which has been overruled by the Apex Court. Commenting on observations made in *Safdarjung Hospital* case (supra), the Apex Court in *Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board* (supra) ruled that it could not possibly agree that running a hospital which is a welfare activity and not a sovereign function, cannot be "industry". Hospital facilities, research products and training services are "service", hence "industry" and absence of profit or functions of training and research would not take the institution, out of the scope of "industry". Accordingly the Apex Court ruled that its decision in *Safdarjung Hospital* case was wrong and activity of running a hospital was not regal activity of the State, hence would fall within the definition of "industry" in as much as the activity would be industry if run by private citizens. Thus it is crystal clear that the Hospital took a wrong stand and the same is discarded.

13. Now factual matrix would be considered. Claimant swears in his affidavit Ex.WW1/A that he was employed as a Stretcher Bearer by the Hospital w.e.f. 28-8-1990. He rendered continuous and uninterrupted service till 31-1-1995. His services were illegally terminated by the Chief Administrative Officer of the Hospital vide order dated 31-1-1995, by giving one month's notice to him. Termination of his services amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Act. Mandatory provisions of Section 25F of the Act were not complied with. During course of his cross examination he conceded that he was absent from service since 1-3-1994. He further admitted that various letters were sent by the Hospital calling upon him to join his duties but those letters were returned back by

his mother as he was not present at his house at that time. He made a candid admission that those letters were received at his house. He feigned ignorance that any notice was published by the Hospital in a newspaper.

14. Dr. Sudhir Chandra swears in his affidavit, tendered as evidence, that the claimant joined his duties on 31-8-1990 and not on 20-8-1990. His services were terminated vide office order dated 31-1-1995, complying laid down procedure in that regard. Notice of one month was given to the claimant and thereafter his services were terminated. As per his service record claimant was absent for 78 days w.e.f. 3-4-1992 to 19-6-1992, one day on 18-9-1993 and 23-1-1994 respectively and 368 days w.e.f. 16-2-1994 to 18-2-1995. His unauthorized absence for the period referred above rendered him unsuitable for the post. Necessary action was initiated against him under the Rules. No question of seeking relief under the provisions of the Act would arise in the matter. During course of his cross examination he projects that there was no question of paying retrenchment compensation to the claimant.

15. Office order No.428/ESTD-3/90 dated 25-9-1990 was filed by the Hospital before this Tribunal. However this document was not referred to by Dr. Sudhir Chandra in his affidavit. On the other hand office order No. A-12012/5/90-MH, New Delhi dated 17-8-1990 has been relied upon by the claimant. When these two documents are perused it emerged that the claimant was appointed in the Hospital as Stretcher Bearer on compassionate grounds w.e.f. 30-8-1990. Director Health Services, Government of India, New Delhi, had accorded sanction to appoint the claimant on the post of Stretcher Bearer on compassionate grounds without reference to the employment exchange. His appointment was subject to Medical Examination and on being found fit. He was to remain on probation for a period of 2 years. In its written statement or in the affidavit of Dr. Sudhir Chandra the Hospital nowhere project a different case. Consequently it emerged over the record that the claimant was appointed as a Stretcher Bearer by the Hospital on compassionate grounds.

16. Whether such an appointment can be on temporary basis? For an answer to this proposition scheme for compassionate appointment, formulated by the Government of India, New Delhi, is to be looked into. The scheme was formulated by the Government of India, vide G.I., Department of Personnel & Training, No. 14014/6/94-Estt. (D), dated the 9th October, 1998. Salient features of the scheme are :

Scheme of compassionate appointment applies to dependent family member—

- (A) of a Government servant who—
  - (a) dies while in service (including death by suicide), or



- (b) is retired on medical grounds under Rule 2 of the CCS (Medical Examination) Rules, 1957, or
- (c) is retired on medical grounds under Rule 38 of the CCS (Pension) Rules, 1972, or
- (B) of a member of the Armed Forces who—
  - (i) dies during service; or
  - (ii) is killed in action; or
  - (iii) is medically boarded out and is unfit for civil employment

Government servant for the purpose of the scheme means, a Government servant appointed on regular basis and not one working on daily wage or casual or apprentice or ad hoc or contract or re-employment basis.

17. Dependent family members has been advised to mean :

- (a) spouse; or
- (b) son (including adopted son); or
- (c) daughter ( including adopted daughter); or
- (d) brother or sister in the case of unmarried Government servant or member of the Armed Forces referred above, who was wholly dependent on the Government servant/member of the Armed Forces at the time of his death in harness or retirement on medical grounds, as the case may be”.

18. Compassionate appointment can be made to Group 'C' or Group 'D' posts against direct recruitment quota. For consideration of application for compassionate appointment family of the Government servant who died in harness or retired on medical grounds should be indigent and deserves immediate assistance for relief from financial destitution and applicant for compassionate appointment should be eligible and suitable for the post in all respects. Compassionate appointments are exempted from observance of:

- (a) Recruitment procedure
- (b) Clearance from the Surplus Cell of the Department of Personnel and Training/Directorate of Employment and Training
- (c) The ban orders on filling of posts issued by the Ministry of Finance (Department of Expenditure)

19. As projected above compassionate appointments are to be made against substantive posts. Claimant was appointed on compassionate grounds as Stretcher Bearer and was to remain on probation for a period of 2 years. The claimant could not be subjected to applicability of the Rules. His service conditions would be governed by the Central Civil Service (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1965. As projected by Dr. Sudhir Chandra, the claimant

remained absent for a period of 78 days w.e.f. 3-4-1992 to 19-6-1992, one day each on 18-9-1993 and 23-1-1994 respectively and 368 days w.e.f. 16-2-94 to 18-2-95. Absence without permission and overstaying leave is gross misconduct under Central Civil Service (Conduct) Rules 1964. For gross misconduct the employer may award penalties as detailed in Rule 11 of CCS (CCA) Rules 1965, which are extracted thus :—

"Minor Penalties —

- (i) censure;
- (ii) withholding of his promotion;
- (iii) recovery from his pay of the whole or part of any pecuniary loss caused by him to the Government by negligence or breach of orders;
- (iii) (a) reduction to a lower stage in the time-scale of pay by one stage for a period not exceeding three years, without cumulative effect and not adversely affecting his pension.
- (iv) withholding of increments of pay;

Major Penalties—

- (v) save as provided for in clause (iii) (a), reduction to a lower stage in the time-scale of pay for a specified period, with further directions as to whether or not the Government servant will earn increments of pay during the period of such reduction and whether on the expiry of such period, the reduction will or will not have the effect of postponing the future increments of his pay;
- (vi) reduction to lower time-scale of pay, grade, post or Service which shall ordinarily be a bar to the promotion of the Government servant to the time-scale of pay, grade, post or Service from which he was reduced, with or without further directions regarding conditions of restoration to the grade, or post or Service from which the Government servant was reduced and his seniority and pay on such restoration to that grade, post or Service;
- (vii) compulsory retirement;
- (viii) removal from service which shall not be a disqualification for future employment under the Government;
- (ix) dismissal from service which shall ordinarily be a disqualification for future employment under the Government”.

20. Procedure for award of major penalties is laid down in Rule 14 of CCS (CCA) Rules 1965. Herein the present controversy procedure provided in Rule 14 for award of major penalty was not followed by the Hospital. On the other hand Hospital belabored under a misconception that it can deal the claimant under the Rules. This misconception completely lead the Hospital authorities astray. There is other facet of the coin. As projected by Dr. Sudhir Chandra in his affidavit Ex.MW1/A the claimant

remained on extra ordinary leave for 78 days w.e.f. 3-4-1992 to 19-6-1992, one day each on 18.9.1993 and 23-1-1994 and for 368 days w.e.f. 16-2-1994 to 18-2-1995. When period of absence was converted to extra ordinary leaves by the Hospital authorities, it does not lie in their mouth to claim that the claimant remained absent for the above period, in an unauthorized manner. Sanction of extra ordinary leaves condones his misconduct. Furthermore extra ordinary leaves were sanctioned to the claimant up to 18-2-1995. As per case of the Hospital, services of the claimant were done away vide order dated 31-1-1995. Thus, it emerges over the record that the Hospital authorities passed an order on 31-1-1995 in anticipation that the claimant would not join his duties till 18-2-1995. Evidently the order nowhere satisfies even standards of the Rules which require the authorities to serve one month's notice to a temporary Government servant for terminating his service. Services of the claimant were dispensed with vide order No. 70-ADMIN (IV) (D) 1995 dated 31-1-1995. This document highlights that one month notice pertaining to order of termination of service in respect of Shri Daljeet Singh was published in Indian Express/Punjab Kesari, New Delhi on 18-1-1995. Therefore even for compliance of the provisions of rule 5 of the Rules Hospital ought to have waited up to 18-2-1995. No such patience was shown by the Hospital authorities and order terminating service of the claimant was passed on 31-1-1995, detailing therein that his services are terminated w.e.f. 18-2-1995 after expiry of one month notice. Thus it is evident that even provisions of the Rules were not complied with. The order passed by the Hospital cannot withstand standards detailed in rule 5 of the Rules or rule 14 of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965. All these factors make it clear that action of the Hospital cannot stand scrutiny of Rules applicable to him.

21. Much hue and cry has been raised by the Hospital projecting that when Rules were applicable to the Claimant he cannot invoke jurisdiction of this Tribunal. For invoking jurisdiction of this Tribunal it is incumbent upon the claimant to project that he is a workman, as defined in Section 2 (s) of the Act. It is not in dispute that the claimant was working as a Stretcher Bearer with the Hospital. A Stretcher Bearer has to perform manual jobs. Such manual jobs would clothe him with a status of workman as defined by the Act. When the claimant answers the definition of a workman, he can invoke jurisdiction of this Tribunal. Applicability of the Rules or CCS (CCA) Rules 1965 would not debar the claimant from knocking the door of this Tribunal, when he happens to be a workman. Therefore, claim projected by the Hospital is unfounded in that regard.

22. Admittedly the claimant rendered continuous service of more than 240 days, as required by Section 25B of the Act. There is no dispute on this issue that the claimant had rendered a continuous service for about four years and six months. Question for consideration comes as to

whether order, on the strength of which services of the claimant were dispensed with, amounts to retrenchment. Retrenchment means discharge of surplus labour. However definition of the term given in Section 2(oo) of the Act make it clear that it would include every kind of termination. In fact the exclusion of cases falling within the purview of sub-clauses (b), (bb) and (c) in the definition would suggest that surplusage of labour is not the test of retrenchment. If the case of termination does not fall under any of the exemptions in Section 2(oo) of the Act, it would be retrenchment. Definition of the terms enacted by the Act, is reproduced thus:

"(oo) "retrenchment" means the termination by the employer of the services of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, but does not include—

- (a) voluntary retirement of the workman; or
- (b) retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation if the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned contains a stipulation in that behalf; or
- (bb) termination of the services of the workman as a result of the non-renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein; or
- (c) termination of the services of a workman on the ground of continued ill-health".

23. Definition of retrenchment is very wide and in two parts. The first part is exhaustive, which lays down that retrenchment means the termination of the service of a workman by the employer "for any reason whatsoever" otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action. Thus main part of the definition itself excludes the termination of service, as a measure of punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action from the ambit of retrenchment. The second part further excludes (i) voluntary retirement of the workman, or (ii) retirement of workman on reaching the age of superannuation of (iii) termination of the service of a workman as a result of non-renewal of contract of employment, or (iv) termination of contract of employment in terms of a stipulation contained in the contract of employment in that behalf, or (v) termination of service on the ground of continued ill health of the workman. Reference can be made to the precedents in Avon Services (Production Agencies) (Pvt.) Ltd. [1979 (I) LLJ 1] and Mahabir [1979 (II) LLJ 363].

24. Whether order dated 31-1-95, on the strength of which services of the claimant were dispensed with, falls within the ambit of exemptions provided by Section 2(oo) of the

Act? It is not the case of the Hospital that after conduct of a domestic enquiry, the claimant was dismissed from service. Efforts were made to project that services of the claimant were done away in accordance with the Rules, governing his conditions of service. At the cost repetition it is said that neither the provisions of the Rules nor the provisions of CCS (CCA) Rules 1965 were complied with. Therefore this case does not fall within the ambit of sub-clause (bb) of clause (oo) of Section 2 of the Act. Action of the Hospital squarely falls within the ambit of retrenchment, as defined by Section 2(oo) of the Act.

25. Section 25F of the Act lays down conditions pre-requisite to retrenchment of workmen. Those conditions are:

- (i) There should be one month's notice in writing to the workmen concerned,
- (ii) The notice should specify the reasons for retrenchment,
- (iii) The period of one month's notice should have expired before retrenchment is enforced, or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice the wages for the period,
- (iv) The workman has been paid retrenchment compensation which should be equivalent to 15 days' average pay for every one year's service or any part thereof in excess of six months,
- (v) The notice is given to the appropriate Government.

26. Non-compliance of the mandatory provisions of Section 25F of the Act would make retrenchment invalid and inoperative as held by the Apex Court in Hospital Mazdoor Sabha (supra). Similar view was taken in National Iron and Steel Co. Ltd. [1967 (II) LLJ 23], wherein it was ruled, "where the retrenchment is invalid in law, it cannot be said to have determined the relationship of employer and employee and the workman will be entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages". But in Surendra Kumar Verma [1981 (I) LLJ 386] the Apex Court ruled that in appropriate cases relief of full back wages can be denied.

27. Here in the case one month's notice, as contemplated by Section 25F of the Act was not given to the claimant. As pointed above notice dated 17-1-95 was in currency when order dated 31-1-95 was passed against the claimant. No retrenchment compensation was paid to the claimant. Hence his retrenchment comes in conflict with the provisions of section 25F of the Act. When retrenchment of the claimant was not justified, action of the Hospital cannot over-ride the statutory provisions. Considering all these facts, I find it to be a case to command the Hospital to reinstate the claimant in service with continuity.

28. It is not a matter of dispute that the claimant remained absent for a considerably long period. This Tribunal cannot remain oblivious to the proposition that for that period the claimant had not rendered any service to the Hospital. On the principle of "no work no pay", no wages are to be awarded in his favour, for the period of absence. Another aspect which emerges over the record is that the claimant had not brought any evidence to establish that he remained unemployed from the date of termination of his services till date through out. It was obligatory on his part to establish that he remained unemployed for that period, in order to seek relief of back wages. Since there is a complete vacuum of evidence, I do not find it to be a case where back wages should be awarded to the claimant. In view of the reasons detailed above it is announced that the Hospital shall reinstate the claimant in service with continuity but without back wages. However, he will get, all consequential benefits of continuity of service. An award is, accordingly, passed. It be sent to the appropriate Government for publication.

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

Dated : 27-07-2012

नई दिल्ली, 13 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3122.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डायरेक्टर, पी.डी.यू. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 332/2011) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

सुरेन्द्र कुमार, अनुभाग अधिकारी

[सं. एल-42012/96/2011-आईआर (डीयू)]

New Delhi, the 13th September, 2012

**S.O. 3122.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby published the Award (Ref. No. 332/2011) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No-1, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the Director, PDU and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-09-2012.

[No. L-42012/96/2011-IR(DU)]

SURENDAR KUMAR, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R.K. YADAV PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL NO. 1, KARARDOOMA COURTS  
COMPLEX, DELHI**

I.D.No. 332/2011

Shri, Devender S/o Shri Jaipal,  
R/o E-628, Gali No. 18 B,  
East Gokul Puri,  
Amar Colony,  
Delhi-110094.

... Workman

**Versus**

The Director PDU,  
Institute for the Physically Handicapped,  
4, Vishnu Digamber Marg,  
New Delhi-110002. . . . Management

**AWARD**

A contractual employee was engaged by the Institute for the Physically Handicapped (hereinafter referred to as the Institute) located at Vishnu Digambar Marg, New Delhi on 20-05-1994 for a period of 89 days. His services were extended for a period of 29 days, which came to an end on 15-09-1994. In the year 1995, he was again engaged for a period of 30 days on 18-01-1995. His term of employment was renewed from time to time and it came to an end on 06-03-1996. The Institute opted not to renew his contract of employment any further. It led the contractual employee to raise an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer. Since conciliation proceedings failed, appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide order No. L-42012/96/2011-IR(DU), New Delhi dated 14-10-2011 with the following terms:

“Whether the action of the management of Institute for Physically Handicapped, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Devender, Daily Wager (S/o Shri Jaipal) with effect from 07-03-1996 is legal and justified? What relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. The contractual employee, namely, Shri Devender filed his claim statement pleading that he was engaged as a daily wager/casual labour by the Institute on 20-05-1994, after completion of all required formalities in accordance with the relevant rules. His name was sponsored by Employment Exchange. He worked to the entire satisfaction of his superiors and had unblemished record of service. He was transferred from the office of the Institute to the office of Director(NI), Ministry of Welfare, Government of India, New Delhi on 08-08-1995. He completed 240 days of continuous service and became entitled for grant on temporary status. When he completed continuous service of 240 days in consecutive two years, he became eligible for being considered for regularisation as Group D employee. Instead of granting temporary status or regularizing his service, the Institute dispensed with his services on 07-03-96, in violation of the rules. Shri Harish Kumar Sharma, who was engaged on 30-08-1994, was retained in service and regularised as Group ‘D’ employee subsequently. Feeling aggrieved by the said act of the Institute, (he filed a writ petition (being WP (C) No. 3700/96) before the High Court of Delhi seeking his reinstatement in service. His writ petition was dismissed on 01-07-2010, which order was assailed before the Division Bench. However, his latter patent appeal was dismissed on 09-08-2010, with an option to approach the proper forum. Termination of his services by the Institute is arbitrary, discriminatory and in violation of the provisions of the

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the Act). He claims reinstatement in service with continuity and full back wages.

3. Claim was demurred by the Institute pleading that engagement of the claimant was contractual in nature and termination of his services would not amount to retrenchment within the meaning of section 2(oo) of the Act. His services came to an end as a result of non renewal of contract of employment and as such it falls within the ambit of sub clause (bb) of clause (oo) of section 2 of the Act. Institute does not dispute that the claimant was engaged as a short term contractual employee from 20-05-1994 till 06-03-1996 in different capacities. He was initially engaged as seasonal waterman on 20-05-1994 for a period of 89 days. His services came to an end on 16-08-1994. After a spell of four months, he was again engaged on daily wage basis with effect from 18-01-1995. He was again appointed as daily wager at different spells till 03-10-1995. On 04-10-1995, he was engaged as OPD Attendant for a period of 88 days. His contractual appointment was extended for a period of 30 days as OPD Attendant from 06-02-1996 to 06-03-1996. Thereafter, the claimant did not seek any further appointment with the Institute. He has not rendered continuous service of 240 days from the date of termination of his services. Since termination of services of the claimant does not amount to retrenchment, he is neither entitled for grant of one months notice or pay in lieu thereof nor retrenchment compensation. Claimant was not entitled for grant of temporary status or regularisation of his services, as claimed. Shri Harish Kumar Sharma was appointed by the Institute on adhoc basis with effect from 28-10-1998 when his name was sponsored by Employment Exchange. He was a matriculate at the time when he was absorbed in the service of the Institute on 18-09-2000. Claimant does not fall at par with Shri Harish Kumar Sharma and hence he cannot agitate that he was discriminated. Filing of writ petition and its dismissal by High Court of Delhi is not disputed. Institute projects that the claim put forward by Shri Devender may be dismissed, being devoid of merits.

4. On pleading of the parties, following issues were settled:

- (i) Whether engagement of the claimant was contractual, for a specific period? If so, its effects?
- (ii) Whether claimant has rendered continuous service of 240 days in the preceding 12 months from the date of his termination?
- (iii) As in terms of reference.

5. Claimant entered the witness box to substantiate facts pleaded in the claim statement, Shri R.K. Sharma, Administration Officer, was examined by the Institute to establish its case. No other witness was examined by either of the parties.



6. Arguments were heard at the bar. Shri K.C. Dubey, authorized representative, advanced arguments on behalf of the claimant. Ms. Surbhi Mehta, authorized representative, presented facts on behalf of the Institute. I have given my careful consideration to the arguments advanced at the bar and cautiously perused the record. My findings on the issues involved in the controversy are as follows :

#### **Issue No.1**

7. Claimant deposed that on 20-05-1994, he joined as casual labour with the Institute. His name was sponsored by Employment Exchange. He was appointed for a period of 89 days vide order Ex.WW1/1. Further extension was granted to him vide order dated 05-09-1994, copy of which is Ex.WW1/2. Vide order dated 23-01-1995, his services were again extended, copy of which order is Ex.WW1/4. On the strength of order dated 21-04-1995, his services were extended, copy of which order is Ex.WW1/5. His services were extended again vide order dated 10-07-1995, copy of which is Ex.WW1/6. Lastly, his services were extended vide order dated 26-02-1996, copy of which order is Ex. WW1/7. During the course of cross examination, he concedes that he was periodically appointed by the Institute.

8. Shri R.K.Sharma details that the claimant was engaged as seasonal waterman on 20-05-1994. He worked upto 16-08-1994. Thereafter he took break of 23 days and returned for his job on 18-01-1995. He worked for one month in that spell. He was engaged again on 21-02-1995 for a period of 59 days. He was again engaged on 25-07-1995 and served upto 03-10-1995. On 04-10-1995, he was engaged on fixed salary of Rs.1500. His services were utilised upto 30-12-2005. On 06-02-1996, he was engaged again for a period of 30 days. Thereafter, he never turned up. During the course of cross examination, he presents that no daily wager is working with the institute. When claimant was engaged as waterman for the first time, at that time 5-6 watermen were engaged.

9. When facts unfolded by the claimant and those projected by Shri Sharma are appreciated, it came to light that the claimant was engaged as waterman on 30-05-1994 for a period of 89 days. He was paid wages @ Rs.49 per day, as emerged out of order Ex.WW1/1. The above order was issued by the Institute to engage watermen since such seasonal requirements arise in hot weather. He was again engaged for a period of 29 days from 18-08-1994 till 15-09-1994, as is evident out of order Ex.WW1/2. Thus, in 1994, the claimant was engaged by the Institute in two spells for 89 days and 29 days respectively. His services came to an end on 15-09-1994. Claimant was engaged again by the Institute on 18.01.1995 for a period of 30 days, vide order Ex. WW1/3. The order makes it apparent that the claimant was to be paid @ Rs.62.80 per day. His services came to an end on 17.02.1995. Vide order dated 06-03-1995,

which is Ex.WW1/4, claimant was again engaged as daily wager for a period of two months with effect from 21-02-1995 to 20-04-1995. Further extension was given to the claimant vide order EXWW1/5 from 24-04-1995 to 20-07-1995. He was again given extension of 88 days from 25-07-1995 to 20-10-1995, vide order Ex.WW1/6. The above appointment/ extensions were granted to the claimant, who worked as daily wager with the Institute in the year 1995.

10. On 06-02-1996, the claimant was engaged as OPD Attendant for a period of 30 days vide order Ex.WW1/7. In that order, it was specifically mentioned that duties of transportation of patients from main gate into OPD and back on wheel chair shall be performed. He was to be paid consolidated amount of Rs.1500.00 per month. It was also clarified therein that his contract was for a period of 30 days, which was liable to be terminated at any time without assigning any reasons. One of the terms of the order Ex.WW1/17 puts an embargo on the claimant not to seek regularization of his service and such claim would not be entertained. It is an admitted case of the parties that no further extension of service was granted by the Institute to the claimant. Thus, it emerges over record that in 1994, the claimant was engaged as seasonal waterman by the Institute. In 1995, he was engaged as daily wager employee for different spells, while in 1996 he was engaged as an OPD Attendant.

11. From the scheme of the Act, it is apparent that following expressions are used therein, which are to be taken into account during adjudication process: (1) industry, (2) industrial concern within the industry, (3) industrial establishment which may itself be part of the industrial concern or which may be part of a larger industrial concern, (4) section of industrial establishment, and (5) categories of workmen in industrial establishments or any section thereof. Employees working In any of the above situation may fall within the ambit of workman. If he works in different categories in industrial establishments or its section thereof, can it be said that his work in different capacities would constitute continuous service. For an answer to this proposition, continuous service, as defined by Section 25B of the Act, is to be taken into account. As emerges from above provisions, a workman had to render uninterrupted service under a particular category of work. If his service in a particular discipline of work comes to an end and he is engaged again in another discipline of work which changes category of his employment, in that situation, services rendered in two different categories would not fall within the ambit of continuous service.

12. The Tribunal had to ascertain as to whether services rendered by the claimant in the capacity of seasonal waterman, daily wager employee and OPD Attendant can be considered to ascertain continuity of his service. Answer has been provided by orders issued by the Institute. As is evident therefore the claimant was



engaged as waterman, daily wager and lastly OPD Attendant. Ex.WW1/1 makes it clear that the claimant was appointed as waterman for 89 days and his services were extended as waterman for another spell of 29 days, as emerge out of order Ex.WW1/2. His services as waterman was for a total period of 89 plus 29 days which comes to 118 days. There was no ambiguity in these two orders as to the specification of the period for which the claimant was engaged as waterman. In January 95, claimant was engaged as daily wager employee for a period of 30 days, which engagement lasted upto 17-02-1995. His engagement as daily wager was extended for a period of two months, vide order dated 06-03-1995. He was given another extension from 24-04-1995 to 21-07-1995. Last extension was given to him in that capacity on 25-07-1995 to 20-10-1995. Orders Ex.WW1/3, Ex.WW1/4, Ex.WW1/5 and Ex.WW1/6 were passed by the Institute in that regard. All these orders specify the periods for which the claimant was engaged as daily wager. Firstly he was appointed for a period of 30 days, which period was extended for two months, again his engagement was extended for 89 days and lastly it was extended for 88 days only. Consequently, as daily wager, claimant worked at different spells for a total period of 30+60+89+88 days, which comes to 267 days. But orders, referred above, highlight specific periods for which claimant was appointed or given extension to work as daily wager. Lastly, he was appointed on 06-02-1996 to work as OPD Attendant and order Ex.WW1/7 was issued in that regard. As OPD Attendant, he was appointed for a period of 30 days, which appointment was never extended. Thus, it is evident that the claimant was engaged for different categories of work by the Institute. Orders Ex.WW1/1 to Ex.WW1/7 make it clear that he was engaged for specific periods to work as waterman, daily wager or OPD Attendant. None of the above order speak of his engagement on regular basis. The issue is, therefore, answered accordingly.

### Issue No.2

13. Out of facts unfolded by the claimant, it came over the record that further extension in his service was not granted by the Institute with effect from 07-03-1996. Orders Ex.WW1/1 to Ex.WW1/7 are not disputed by the Institute. Out of facts proved by the parties, the Tribunal has to ascertain as to whether claimant rendered continuous service of 240 days in preceding 12 months from the date of his alleged termination. At the cost of repetition, it is pointed out that the contract of employment of the claimant was not extended, when he was working as OPD Attendant. He worked in that capacity only for a period of 30 days. It is crystal clear that as OPD Attendant, claimant had not rendered continuous service of 240 days in preceding 12 months. For the purpose of continuous service, as contemplated by the provisions of Section 25B of the Act, the claimant must establish that he worked under the Institute for a period of one year. He shall be deemed to have been in continuous service for a period of one year if

he has actually worked under the employer for 240 days in the preceding period of twelve months. Section 25B of the Act uses the words “under the employer” for ascertainment of continuous service for a period of one year. Considering the fact that he was employed in different categories, his engagement as OPD Attendant would not constitute as continuous service to his engagement as a daily wager. However the Act is a beneficial legislation and Section 25B of the Act nowhere discards actual works in two different categories, rendered by a workman, for ascertainment of his continuous service. When facts are gauzed on these lines, it would come to light that the claimant had rendered continuous service of 240 days in preceding 12 months from the date of his alleged termination. Records tell that from 06-03-1996 to 06-02-1996 he worked for 30 days, from 20-10-1995 to 25-07-1995 he worked for 88 days, from 21-07-1995 to 24-04-1995 he worked for 89 days and from 21-04-1995 to 07-03-1995 he worked for 43 days. Thus as emerging from the records of service, it can be said that the claimant had rendered continuous service with the Institute for a period 240 days in preceding 12 months from the date of his alleged termination. Issue is, accordingly, answered.

### Issue No. 3

14. For an answer to the issue referred for adjudication, it would be expedient to ascertain whether termination of services of claimant amounts to retrenchment? For an answer, definition of the term is to be construed. Clause (oo) of Section 2 of the Act defines retrenchment. For the same of convenience, the said definition is extracted thus:

“(oo) “retrenchment” means the termination by the employer of the services of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, but does not include—

- (a) voluntary retirement of the workman; or
- (b) retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation if the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned contains a stipulation in that behalf; or
- (bb) termination of the services of the workman as a result of the non- renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein; or
- (c) termination of the services of a workman on the ground of continued ill-health”.

15. Definition of retrenchment is very wide and in two parts. The first part is exhaustive, which lays down that retrenchment means the termination of the service of a workman by the employer “for any reason whatsoever” otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of

disciplinary action. Thus main part of the definition itself excludes the termination of service, as a measure of punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action from the ambit of retrenchment. The second part further excludes (i) voluntary retirement of the workman, or (ii) retirement of workman on reaching the age of superannuation, or (iii) termination of the service of a workman as a result of non-renewal of contract of employment, or (iv) termination of contract of employment in terms of a stipulation contained in the contract of employment in that behalf, or (v) termination of service on the ground of continued ill health of the workman. Reference can be made to the precedents in *Avon Services (Production Agencies) (Pvt.) Ltd.* (1979 (I) LLJ 1) and *Mahabir* (1979 (II) LLJ 363).

16. Sub Clause (bb) purports to exclude from the ambit of the definition of retrenchment (i) termination of the service of a workman as a result of non-renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned, on its expiry, or (ii) termination of the contract of employment in terms of a stipulation contained in the contract of employment in that behalf. The first part relates to termination of service of a workman as a result of non-renewal of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned on its expiry. Thus “non-renewal of contract of employment” pre-supposes an existing contract of employment, which is not renewed. When services of an employee is terminated on account of non-renewal of contract of employment, between the employer and the workman, it does not amount to retrenchment. The second part refers to “such contract” being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein. The cases contemplated, under this part too, would not amount to retrenchment. However this sub-clause, being in the nature of an exception to clause (oo) of Section 2 of the Act, is ruled to be construed strictly when contractual agreement is used as *modus operandi* to frustrate claim of the employee to become regular or permanent against a job. The adjudicator has to address himself to the question whether the period of employment was stipulated in the contract of employment as a device to escape the applicability of the definition of retrenchment. See *Shailendra Nath Shukla* (1987 Lab. I.C. 1607), *Dilip Hanumantrao Shrike* (1990 Lab. I.C. 100) and *Balbair Singh* (1990 (1) LLJ. 443). On review of law laid by the Apex Court and various High Courts, a single Judge of the Madhya Pradesh High Court, in *Madhya Pradesh Bank Karamchari Sangh* (1996 Lab. I.C. 1161) has laid following principles of interpretation and application of sub-clause (bb) of clause (oo) of section 2 of the Act:

- “(i) that the provisions of section 2(oo)(bb) are to be construed benevolently in favour of the workman,
- (ii) that if the workman is allowed to continue in service by making periodic appointments from time to time, then it can be said that the case would not fall under section 2(oo)(bb),

- (iii) that the provisions of Section 2 (oo)(bb) are not to be interpreted in the manner which may stifle the main provision,
- (iv) that if the workman continues in service, the non-renewal of the contract can be deemed as *mala fide* and it may amount to be a fraud on statute;
- (v) that there would be wrong presumption of non-applicability of Section-2(oo)(bb) where the work is of continuous nature and there is nothing on record that the work for which a workman has been appointed had come to an end”.

17. Whether provisions of retrenchment, enacted in the Act, provide for any security of tenure? Answer lies in negative. Provisions of retrenchment provide for certain benefits to a workman in case of termination of his service, falling within the ambit of definition of retrenchment. On compliance of the requirements of section 25F or 25N and 25G of the Act, it is open to the employer to retrench a workman.

18. Termination of service of an employee during the period of probation was held to be covered by the exception contained in sub-clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) of the Act, in *C.M. Venugopal* [1994 (1) LLJ 597]. As per fact of the case, Regulation 14 of the Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulation, 1962 empowered the Corporation to terminate the service of an employee within the period of probation. The employee was put on probation for a period of one year, which was extended by another year. Since he could not achieve the target to earn confirmation, his service was terminated in terms of Regulation 14 as well as order of appointment. The Apex Court ruled that the case was covered by the exception contained in sub-clause (bb), hence it was not retrenchment.

19. In *Morinda Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd.* (1996 Lab. I.C. 221) a sugar factory used to employ certain number of workmen during crushing season and at the end to the crushing season their employment used to cease. The Supreme Court held that despite the fact that the workmen worked for more than 240 days in a year, cessation of their employment at the end of crushing season would not amount to retrenchment in view of the provisions of sub-clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) of the Act. It was observed as follows:

“4. It would thus be clear that the respondents were not working throughout the season. They worked during crushing seasons only. The respondents were taken into work for the season and consequent to closure of the season, they ceased to work.

5. The question is whether such a cessation would amount to retrenchment. Since it is only a seasonal work, the respondents cannot be said to have been retrenched in view of what is stated in sub-clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) of the Act. Under these circumstances, we are of the opinion

that the view taken by the Labour Court and the High Court is illegal. However, the appellant is directed to maintain a register for all workmen engaged during the seasons enumerated herein before and when the new season starts the appellant should make a publication in neighbouring places in which the respondents normally live and if they would report for duty, the appellant would engage them in accordance with seniority and exigency of work”.

20. Above legal position was reiterated by the Apex Court in *Anil Bapurao Kanase* [1997 (10) S.C.C. 599] wherein it was noted as follows:

“3. The learned counsel for the appellant contends that the judgment of the High Court of Bombay relied on in the impugned order dated 28-3-1995 in Writ Petition No. 488 of 1994 is perhaps not applicable. Since the appellant has worked for more than 180 days, he is to be treated as retrenched employee and if the procedure contemplated under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is applied, his retrenchment is illegal. We find no force in this contention. In *Morinda Coop. Sugar Mills Ltd. v. Ram Kishan* in para 3, this Court has dealt with engagement of the seasonal workman in sugarcane crushing, in para 4, it is stated that it was not a case of retrenchment of the workman, but of closure of the factory after the crushing season was over. Accordingly, in para 5, it was held that it is not ‘retrenchment’ within the meaning of Section 2(oo) of the Act. As a consequence the appellant is not entitled to retrenchment as per sub-clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) of the Act. Since the present work is seasonal business, the principles of the Act have no application. However, this Court has directed that the respondent management should maintain a register and engage the workmen when the season starts in the succeeding years in the order of seniority. Until all the employees whose names appear in the list are engaged in addition to the employees who are already working, the management should not go in for fresh engagement of new workmen. It would be incumbent upon the respondent management to adopt such procedure as is enumerated above”.

21. In *Harmohinder Singh* [2001 (5) S.C.C. 540] an employee was appointed as a salesman by Kharga canteen on 1-6-74 and subsequently as a cashier on 9-8-75. The letter of appointment and Standing Orders, inter alia, provided that his service could be terminated by one month’s notice by either party. He was served with a notice to the effect that his service would be relinquished with effect from 30-6-1989. Relying precedent in *Uptron India Ltd.* [1998 (6) S.C.C. 538] the Apex Court ruled that contract of service for a fixed term are excluded from the ambit of retrenchment. Decision in *Balbir Singh* (supra) was held to be erroneous. It was also ruled that principles of natural justice are not applicable where termination takes place on expiry of contract of service.

22. In *Batala Coop. Sugar Mills Ltd.* [2005 (8) S.C.C. 481] an employee was engaged on casual basis on daily wages for specific work and for a specific period. He was engaged on 1-4-1986 and worked upto 12-2-94. The Labour Court concluded that termination of his services was violative of provisions of Section 25-F of the Act, hence ordered for his reinstatement with 50% back wages. Relying precedents in *Morinda Coop. Sugar Mills* (supra) and *Anil Bapurao Kanase* (supra) the Apex Court ruled that since his engagement was for a specific period and specific work, relief granted to him by the Labour Court can not be maintained.

23. The Apex Court dealt with such a situation again in *Darbara Singh* (2006 LLR 68) wherein an employee was appointed by the Punjab State Electricity Board as peon on daily wage basis from 8-1-88 to 29-2-88. His services were extend from time to time and finally dispensed with in June, 1989. The Supreme Court ruled that engagement of *Darbara Singh* was for a specific period and conditional. His termination did not amount to retrenchment. His case was found to be covered under exception contained in sub-clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) of the Act. In *Kishore Chand Samal* (2006 LLR 65), same view was maintained by the Apex Court. It was ruled therein that the precedent in *S.M. Nilajkar* [2003 (II) LLJ 359] has no application to the controversy since it was ruled therein that mere mention about the engagement being temporary without indication of any period attracts section 25 F of the Act if it is proved that the concerned workman had worked continuously for more than 240 days. Case of *Darbara Singh* and *Kishan Chand Samal* were found to be relating to fixed term of appointment.

24. In *BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.* (2006 LLR 1144) *Rakesh Kumar* was appointed as Copyist on 29-9-89, initially for a period of three months as a daily wager. His term of appointment was extended up to 20-9-90. No further extension was given and his services were dispensed with on 20-9-90. On consideration of facts and law High Court of Delhi has observed thus :

“...In the present case, the respondent was appointed as a copyist for totalling the accounts of ledger for the year 1986-87 and then for 1987-88. His initial appointment was for the period of three months. It was extended from time to time and no extension was given after 20th September, 1990. He was appointed without any regular process of appointment, purely casual and on temporary basis for specific work of totalling of ledger. When this work was over, no extension was given. I consider that appointment as that of the respondent is squarely covered under section 2(oo)(bb) of the Act. Giving of non extension did not amount to termination of service, it was not a case of retrenchment”.

25. Precedents, handed down by Allahabad High Court in *Shailendra Nath Shukla* (supra), Bombay High



Court in Dilip Hanumantrao Shirke (supra), Punjab & Haryana High Court in Balbir Singh (supra) and Madhya Pradesh High Court in Madhya Pradesh Bank Karamchari Sangh (supra) castrate sub-clause (bb) of section 2(oo) of the Act. Ratio decidendi in these precedents abrogates statutory provisions of sub-clause (bb) of section 2 (oo) of the Act without even discussing the legality or constitutional validity of the clause. On the other hand the Apex Court in C.M.Venugopal (supra), Morinda Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd. (supra), Anil Bapurao Kanase (supra), Harmohinder Singh (supra), Batala Co-op. Sugar Mills Ltd. (supra), Darbara Singh (supra) and Kishore Chand Samal (supra) and High Court of Delhi in BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (supra) spoke that case of an employee, appointed for a specific period which was extended from time to time, would be covered by the exception contained in sub-clause (bb) of section 2(oo) of the Act, in case his services are dispensed with as a result of non-renewal of the contract of employment between him and his employer, on its expiry or termination of the contract of employment in terms of a stipulation contained in the contract of employment in that behalf. The law, so laid, holds the water and would be applied to the case of the claimant.

26. As projected above, claimant was appointed by the Institute in different capacities, first as waterman; then as daily wage employee and lastly as OPD Attendant for specific periods. His appointment as OPD Attendant was not extended. However, his appointment as daily wage employee got extension from time to time. His services came to an end when the Institute had not renewed his contract of employment. His case squarely fell within the ambit of exemption available under sub-clause (bb) of clause (oo) of section 2 of the Act. It cannot be said that by non-renewal of the contract of employment, the Institute retrenched the employee. Thus, it is evident that termination of services of the claimant does not amount to retrenchment. Provisions of section 25F of the Act does not come into play.

27. Claimant places relies on the precedent in Devender Singh [2011 (6) SSC 584] in which case appellant was engaged as clerk for a period of 6 months on contract basis. On expiry of 6 months, his services were extended for another term of 6 months from 01-11-1995 to 20-04-1996. This exercise was again repeated and his term of employment was extended for another period upto 01-05-1996. However, his engagement was discontinued with effect from 30-09-1996 without giving any notice or pay in lieu thereof and retrenchment compensation. In the light of the facts referred above, Apex Court ruled that plea taken by the management that its case was covered by Section 2(oo) (bb) of the Act was squarely misconceived. It was further emphasized that no material was produced by the management to show that engagement of the appellant was discontinued relying upon the terms and conditions of his employment. Precedent relied by the

claimant is based on distinct and different facts. Services of the appellant in the precedent were done away with during currency of extension period. Since extension period was in currency, that case was beyond the ambit of section 2(oo)(bb) of the Act. Here in the case, services of the claimant came to an end on account of non-renewal of contract of employment after 06-03-1996. Under these circumstances, the said precedent cannot espouse cause of the claimant.

28. Whether the claimant can project that by engaging Shri Harish Kumar Sharma as an adhoc employee and thereafter regularising his services, the Institute has discriminated him? As testified by the claimant, Shri Harish Kumar Sharma initially joined the Institute on 16-12-1997. Thereafter, an order was passed in his favour on 29-10-1998. Subsequently, his services were regularized vide order dated 03-10-2000. Claimant nowhere disputes that Shri Harish Kumar Sharma is a matriculate, while he is middle pass. It is also not disputed that the name of Shri Harish Kumar Sharma was sponsored by Employment Exchange and he was appointed as attendant on adhoc basis on 29-10-1998. When Shri Sharma was appointed as adhoc attendant, at that time claimant was not working with the Institute. Can the claimant project that the job of attendant was to be offered to him by the Institute, in view of the provisions of section 25H of the Act? As detailed above, claimant was lastly working as OPD Attendant. Shri Harish Kumar Sharma was appointed as Attendant and not as OPD Attendant. On the post of Attendant, claimant was never employed. Consequently, it is apparent that the post, which was manned by the claimant at a point of time, was not given to Shri Harish Kumar Sharma. Even otherwise, Shri Harish Kumar Sharma was better qualified than the claimant.

29. Equality before law and equal protection of laws are fundamental rights of every person, ordains Article 14 of the Constitution. The guiding principles laid in Article 14 are that persons, who are similarly situated, shall be treated alike both in privileges conferred and liability imposed, which means that amongst equals the law should be equal and should be equally administered and that like should be treated alike. Article 16 of the Constitution guarantees equality of opportunities for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State. What is guaranteed is the equality of opportunity. Like all other employers, government is also entitled to pick and choose from amongst a large number of candidates offering themselves for employment. But the selection process must not be arbitrary. The guarantee given by clause (a) of Article 16 of the Constitution will cover (a) initial appointments (b) promotions (c) termination of employment (d) and matters relating to salary, periodical increments, leaves, gratuity, pension, age of superannuation etc. Matters relating to employment or appointments include all matters in relations to employment

both prior and subsequent to the employment which are incidental to the employment and form part of the terms and conditions of such employment.

30. Fundamental rights guaranteed by Article 14 forbids class legislation, but does not forbid classification or differentiation which rests upon reasonable ground of discretion. Classification is the recognition of the relations, and in making it the Government must be allowed a wide latitude of discretion and judgment. In a way, the consequences of such classification would undoubtedly be to differentiate persons belonging to that class from others. The classification must be founded on an intelligible differentia which distinguishes persons or things that are grouped together from others left out of the group and the differentia must have a rational relation to the object sought to be achieved. Classification may be made according to the nature of persons, nature of business, and may be based with reference to time.

31. Concept of equality guaranteed by Article 16 of the Constitution is something more than formal equality and enables the underprivileged groups to have a fair share by having more than equal chance and enables the State to give favoured treatment to those groups by achieving real equality with reference to social needs. 'Protection discrimination' enabled the State to adopt new strategy to bring underprivileged at par with the rest of the society, by providing all possible opportunities and incentives to them. Therefore a class may be allowed to have preferential treatment in the matter relating to employment or appointment. There cannot be rule of equality between members of separate and independent group of persons. Persons can be classified in different groups, based on in terms of nature of persons, nature of business and with reference to time.

32. The Institute engaged Shri Harish Kumar Sharma as Attendant, who was better qualified than the claimant. His engagement as Attendant was made through Employment Exchange. Name of the claimant as OPD Attendant was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange. Therefore, it is evident that the claimant and Shri Harish Kumar Sharma were on different pedestals. It does not lie in the mouth of the claimant to assert that he has not been equally treated with Shri Harish Kumar Sharma. Unequals cannot be treated as equals. Hence, it cannot be said that by appointing Shri Harish Kumar Sharma as Attendant, the Institute has discriminated the claimant. On this aspect too, I do not find any case of indulgence in favour the claimant.

33. In view of the foregoing reasons, it is apparent that there is no case in favour of the claimant. Non-renewal of his contract of employment does not amount to retrenchment. In such a situation, he cannot get protection of section 25F of the Act. He has no claim for reinstatement in the service of the Institute as OPD assistant. Resultantly,

his claim is brushed aside. An award is, accordingly, passed in favour of the Institute and against the claimant. It be sent to the appropriate Government for publication

Dated 16-08-2012.

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3123.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जेट लाईट (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 2, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 24/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/119/1999-आई आर (सी-I)]

अजीत कुमार, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2012

**S.O. 3123.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 24/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No-II, Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of JET LITE (INDIA) LIMITED and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-09-2012.

[No. L-11012/119/1999-IR (C-I)]

AJEET KUMAR, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI SATNAM SINGH,  
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,  
KARKARDOOMA, DELHI-110032**

**ID No. 24/2000**

#### In the matter between :

Capt. R. Khosla S/o Shri R.K. Khosla,  
A-160, Sector 21, Noida,  
UP-201301.

... Applicant/claimant.

#### Versus

JET LITE (INDIA) LIMITED

6, Park Road, Lucknow,  
Lucknow-226001 (UP)

... Management



### AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour *vide* Order No. L-11012/119/99-IR(C-I) dated 27-01-2002 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Controller, Sahara Airlines Ltd., 7th floor, Ambadeep Building, 14 Kasturba Gandhi Marg, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001 in terminating the services of Capt. R. Khosla, Ex-Pilot, resident of A-160, Jalvayu Vihar, Sector-21, Noida UP-201301 with effect from 16.07.1998 is justified, valid and legal? If not, to what relief and benefits is he entitled?"

1. In his statement of claim the applicant has submitted that he was appointed as pilot by Sahara Airlines Ltd. with effect from 1.11.1994. As an Ex-Air Force Officer, he was having nearly 2700 hours flying and Master Green category and also holding civil flying license (ALTP). Due to his hard work and accident free flying, he was given commendation letter besides higher salary and perks *vide* letter No. SIAL/HQ/PERS/95/1054 dated 13.11.1995. After more than three and half years of continuous service the applicant Capt. R Khosla received letter No. SIAL/HQ/PERS/98/468 dated 16.07.1998 terminating his services with immediate effect.

2. Capt. R. Khosla raised industrial dispute under Section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act. However, the conciliation proceedings resulted in failure and the Central Govt. has made the above mentioned reference to this Tribunal. It is further submitted by the applicant that there are two categories of pilots working with the opposite party *vis.* like Capt. R. Khosla with an Air Force background and others like Capt. GPS Grewal who were civilian pilots throughout their career. Since Capt. R. Khosla was excellent in his professional skill as determined by an impartial foreign expert like Capt. Landowsky, he became the victim of petty jealousy by a group of civilian pilots. Deliberately, he was not considered for the position of Commander. The negative feeling with two groups can be seen from the applicant letter dated 10.03.1998 to the opposite party. That applicant Capt. R. Khosla was served a memorandum of charges on 05.06.1998 and he was placed under suspension with immediate effect. The charges were completely vague and lacking in particulars regarding date, time, place, exact language used and against whom and who had reported the matter to the authorities. As such Capt. R Khosla asked for necessary particulars *vide* his letter dated 06.06.1998. That after a lapse of about two weeks he received letter dated 20.06.1998 which may be described as second memorandum of charges. That the opposite party had conducted a preliminary enquiry and increased the ambit of his alleged misconduct to four separate charges of using derogatory and abusive language against the company and his seniors. However, copy of the preliminary report

was not given to Capt. R. Khosla though nature of charges had been considerably enlarged from the memorandum dated 05.06.1998. Capt. R. Khosla submitted his explanation to the second show cause notice *vide* letter dated 25.06.1998. Subsequently, an enquiry committee was formed to enquire into the charges of misconduct on 02.07.1998.

3. That Capt. GPS Grewal, GM Operations (N) who issued both the letters dated 05.06.1998 and 20.06.1998 and had placed Capt. R. Khosla under suspension was a member of the enquiry committee. Capt. R. Khosla was naturally apprehensive about the biased attitude of Capt. Grewal and specifically objected to his being a member of the enquiry committee but the objection was brushed aside and the said officer had signed the findings and conclusions of the enquiry committee causing grave prejudice to the workman.

4. It is further the case of the applicant that memorandum of charges before the enquiry committee consisted of two charges for using unparliamentary language against Capt. SPS Sandhu and one charge of using abusive language against 'senior management'. These charges were vague, nebulous, non-specific and lacking in particulars about the precise language used, dates and places of occurrence and the names of the senior management. This is also not enumerated as misconduct in the standing order of the company.

5. That surprisingly, during the proceedings of the enquiry committee which met only on 06.07.1998, the case of the management was presented by Mr. AK Trehan Advocate whereas Capt. R. Khosla was forced to defend himself personally and he was not allowed representation by legal counsel or any other qualified officer. That the enquiry committee only recorded the statement of one witness Mr. Sanjay Kumar and all the remaining witnesses did not record the statements personally but only their letters/complaints submitted earlier were taken on record and they did not affirm before the enquiry the statements made by them earlier in those letters/complaints. That there were no proceedings of the enquiry committee after 06.07.1998 in the presence of Capt. R. Khosla and subsequent portions of the proceedings have been fabricated later including the findings and conclusions of the enquiry committee. That Capt. Nilesh Guha and Capt. Atul Mehta have made patently false statements. Both these witnesses as well as Shri Jaskirat were never made available to him for cross-examination. That there is obvious contradiction in paras 6 and 7 of the enquiry proceedings as the enquiry committee stated that complainant specifically asked for these witnesses to be cross-examined but immediately thereafter stated that the complainant did not ask for appearance of any witness.

6. That Capt. R Khosla was not given any opportunity to make a statement or to examine witnesses in his defence. That the witnesses except Mr. Sanjay Kumar

did not affirm their statements personally and the proceedings had been completed with undue haste behind the back of the complainant with the preconceived idea of toeing the line of the management and to find Capt. R. Khosla guilty of the charge levelled against him. That the enquiry committee has not conducted itself impartially and they have acted in violation of the principles of natural justice. They even have expressed their opinion that the charges have not been disproved by Capt. R. Khosla thereby ignoring the basic norms that he is presumed to be innocent and the burden of proving the charges rests entirely with the management.

7. Further the enquiry committee proceedings were not given to the complainant for showing cause against the findings and conclusions of the enquiry and the evidence on which it was based. That the proceedings were produced for the first time during the conciliation proceedings only. That the findings of the committee are completely perverse and based on no evidence or insufficient evidence. That the charges contained in the memorandum of charges are lacking in particulars, witnesses have not been examined directly by the committee and they were also not made available for being cross-examined. That Capt. R. Khosla was not properly represented and he was not asked to make a statement or produce defence witnesses. That Capt. GPS Grewal was in charge of Operations Division and was not competent under the rules and regulations of the company to issue a memorandum of charges or place Capt. R. Khosla under suspension. That by making Capt. Grewal as member, the enquiry was reduced to mockery and idle ceremony. That the proceedings of the enquiry were conducted in the presence of Capt. R. Khosla only on 06.07.1998 and he was under the bona fide impression that the enquiry had aborted. That the witnesses sought by him were not produced for cross-examination. That surprisingly after receiving the report of the enquiry committee the opposite party did not proceed to the logical conclusion by issuing second show cause notice against the proposed punishment. That in fact he was not given any disciplinary punishment and his services were terminated vide letter dated 16.07.1998.

8. It is also the case of the applicant that his termination of services is not a discharge simpliciter but as a cloak for awarding the punishment of dismissal which could not have been awarded for the extremely trivial charges. The termination of services of the applicant is violative of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act. According to the applicant he has remained continuously unemployed since his services were terminated by the opposite party.

9. According to the applicant he is also entitled to various dues totalling Rs.4,59,348.80 which have been wrongfully withheld by the opposite party. The applicant,

therefore has prayed that this Tribunal may be pleased to answer the reference of the Central Govt. by making the award as follows:

- (a) That the termination of service of Capt. R. Khosla by the Sahara Airlines Ltd. with effect from 16.07.1998 is illegal, void and inoperative.
- (b) Declaration that Capt. R. Khosla is entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages w.e.f. 16.07.1998.
- (c) That Capt. R. Khosla is entitled to have his flying license updated with Boeing Endorsement by the DGCA, at the expense of the Sahara Airlines.
- (d) That suspension of service of Capt. R. Khosla vide letter dated 05.06.1998 is illegal and void.
- (e) That Capt. R. Khosla is entitled to be paid Rs. 4,59,348.80 with interest @ 18% P.A till the date of actual payment, by M/s. Sahara Airlines Ltd. for payment of dues by the employer prior to 16.07.1998.
- (f) Any other order or direction which the Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper and in the interest of justice.

10. The management has contested the claim of the applicant and has filed its written statement in which it is submitted that the applicant is guilty of suppressing suppressio-veri and falso suggestion. He has not come to the Tribunal with true and correct facts and is guilty of misrepresentation and concealment of material facts. That the applicant prior to the filing of the present claim had been indulging in pressure tactics with sham and bogus allegations and when the respondent did not succumb to the pressure tactics, he has filed the present claim on false and frivolous grounds. That this Tribunal does not have the jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the present matter as the applicant does not fall in the category of workman as laid under Section 2(S) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. That services of the applicant have been terminated after holding an enquiry into the charges of misconduct communicated to him and the enquiry has been conducted by following the procedure and there is no lacking in the procedure followed for holding the enquiry including the ultimate punishment.

11. While replying on merits, the management has disputed the submission of the applicant that due to hard work and accident free flying he was given commendation letter besides higher salary and perks and it is submitted that the applicant was in fact given a warning by Director General, Civil Aviation vide his letter No. 1-750/92-L(2) dated 04.09.1995 and he was warned to be more careful in future. The management has denied that the applicant was a victim of petty jealousy by a group of civilian pilots. In fact, Capt. R. Khosla in his letter dated 23.04.1996 had clearly stated "with respect to SIA I am not in a position to set any crew

allocation or recommend "promotion". Thus, in fact he was not recommended for promotion, by Capt. R. Landowski in his letter. It is asserted by the management that the charges were specific and there was no enlargement made of such charges. That applicant never objected to Capt. GPS Grewal being a member of the enquiry committee. His objection now that he had specifically objected to Capt. GPS Grewal being a member is an after thought without any truth/solid base. It is also asserted by the management that there was no Advocate namely A.K. Trehan with the opposite party at the time of holding of enquiry. In fact, Mr. S.K. Trehan is legal advisor and he never participated in the proceedings of the enquiry committee. Anything stated contrary to that by applicant Capt. R. Khosla has been denied. It is submitted that perusal of Annexures G and H attached with the application clearly show that the applicant himself had cross-examined Capt. Romi Sharma and Shri Seth during the enquiry. That while on one end the applicant has attached verbatim record of questions/answers of the witnesses as Annexures G and H and at the same time he is stating that the statement of one witness was recorded. That at the instance of applicant, Capt. Nilesh Guha and Capt. Atul Mehta were required to appear for cross-examination by the applicant but he refused to cross-examine them. The statements of Capt. Nilesh Guha and Capt. Atul Mehta have been attached as Annexures I and J and at the same time, he is misleading the Tribunal that they were not available for cross-examination. That the enquiry proceedings were completed by following the prescribed procedure including giving ample opportunity to the applicant to answer the charges levelled against him as also cross-examining the witnesses. The allegations that the proceedings have been concluded with undue haste is totally devoid of any reasoning. The applicant refused to cross-examine Capt. Guha and Capt. Mehta. That the enquiry conducted is impartial and independent and the applicant was given ample opportunity to defend himself. That the order of dismissal is neither unfair nor victimization. That the management had written two letters dated 28-09-1998 and 05-07-1999 advising the applicant to collect his dues from the management but instead of doing the same he has mischievously come to this Tribunal. The management, therefore, has prayed for dismissal of the claim of the applicant.

12. The applicant has filed replication whereby he has denied the allegations of the management and has reiterated his own averments made in the statement of claim.

13. Evidence of both the parties has been taken. I have heard arguments from both parties and have also perused the record.

14. According to the applicant he falls in the category of "workman" and as such he has rightfully come to this Tribunal for redressal of his grievances. The management on the other hand strongly disputes the same and claims

that the applicant is not a "workman" as defined under Section 2(S) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. This aspect is crucial in this case and the onus to prove the same lies on the applicant.

15. As per the case of the applicant he was appointed as pilot by Sahara Airlines Limited with effect from 1-11-1994 and pilot falls in the category of "workman" within the meaning of Section 2(S) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. In support of his contention he relies upon Mathur Aviation Vs. Lt. Governor, Delhi 1978 (36) FLR 7 wherein a Single Judge of the Delhi High Court has held that pilot is a workman within the meaning of Section 2(S) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The argument put forth from the side of the applicant is referred to in the order dated February 23, 2012 passed by the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi. However, the Hon'ble Division Bench has further observed in the same order as under :

"This argument, however, ignores that the issue of workman has to be decided and determined on the basis of evidence produced [see Sonepat Cooperative Sugar Mills Ltd. Vs. Ajit Singh (2005) 3 SCC (232)]."

Taking a cue from the above observations by the Hon'ble Division Bench of the Delhi High Court it is evident that the matter is not so simple and the issue whether pilot is a workman or not has to be decided and determined on the basis of the evidence produced in the case.

16. In support of the stand of the management that Capt. R. Khosla is not a workman, the management in the evidence of their witness, Shri Gaurav, Asstt. Manager has asserted that applicant Capt. R. Khosla is not a workman as defined in Section 2(S) of the I.D. Act, 1947. Shri Gaurav Kumar, Asstt. Manager has testified that the applicant is highly educated and professionally trained and competent to take decisions independently and his last drawn salary was more than Rupees one lakh. The nature of duties performed by him involve taking of independent decisions, control and supervision over the crew members of the aircraft. All crew members in the flight used to function on instructions and under guidance and control of the applicant. He was overall responsible for all the decisions to be taken while flying. Shri Gaurav Kumar has asserted that the nature of his employment in discharging the duties is managerial and supervisory in nature. Further, the applicant is responsible for overall safety and security of the passengers including crew members. Thus, the relationship of Capt. R. Khosla with the passengers and crew members was that of a trust while flying and their safety, security and their lives rested in the hands of the applicant.

17. The above evidence of the management has hardly been challenged from the side of the applicant and it is almost un rebutted. Further, before joining the Sahara Airlines Limited on 1-11-1994, the applicant Capt. R. Khosla



of his own admission was an Ex. Air Force Officer and he was having nearly 2700 hours of flying to his credit and he was Master Green category and also holding civil flying license (ALTP) and due to his hard work and accident free flying he was given commendation letter besides higher salary and perks. In this situation and in view of the evidence on record it is difficult to hold that Capt. R. Khosla falls in the category of "workman". It may be useful to point out here that teachers as well as doctors who have done their MD/MS have also not been held to be workmen. In AIR 1988 SC 1700, the teachers have not been held to be "workmen" as their main function was not considered as skilled manual work or technical work as education was in the nature of a mission or a noble vocation. In 1997(75) FLR 814, it was contended that the doctor is a workman as the duties performed by a doctor are based on technical skill. Refuting this argument, The Hon'ble Apex Court has held that every work of technical nature which involves technical skill does not give rise to relationship of employer and employee. In the case of doctors, the concept of fiduciary relationship between doctors and patients will be obliterated if doctors are treated as "workmen". It was thus held that "doctor" cannot claim the status of "workman" as defined in Section 2(S) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The reasoning of the Hon'ble Apex Court given in these two rulings apply with full force in the case at hand also where the pilot apart from other duties performed by him as mentioned above enjoys the relationship trust *vis-a-vis* the passengers in the aircraft and the crew members. In view of the totality of evidence brought on record in this case, it is difficult to hold Capt. R. Khosla as "workman" as defined under Section 2(S) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

18. As Capt. R Khosla has been held to be not a "workman" in this case, this Tribunal consequently does not have the jurisdiction to try and adjudicate upon the present reference.

19. In any case, the services of Capt. R Khosla have been terminated in this case by holding a domestic enquiry. Despite my above mentioned findings I propose to deal with this aspect as well in this judgment. According to the management, the services of Capt. R. Khosla were dispensed with though not required under the law after holding a domestic enquiry on charges communicated to him. Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Asstt. Manager of the management in his evidence on affidavit has asserted that the enquiry has been conducted in a fair, impartial and proper manner by following the prescribed procedure and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The applicant was given ample opportunities to participate and defend himself in the enquiry. He participated in the enquiry and also cross-examined the witnesses of the management produced during the course of the enquiry. Thereafter, the enquiry committee submitted its report wherein the charges were found to be fully established against the applicant and accordingly the services of Capt. R. Khosla were dispensed with *vide* letter dated 16-07-1998 Ex. RW1/3.

Capt. R. Khosla on the other hand, finds various faults in the conduct of the domestic enquiry and has contended that impartial, fair and proper enquiry has not been held in this case and he was not given opportunity to defend himself and the enquiry had concluded in haste. According to him, he was served with a memorandum of charges on 05-06-1998 and the charges were completely vague and lacking in particulars regarding date, time, place, exact language used and against whom and who had reported the matter to the authorities. As such he asked for necessary particulars *vide* his letter dated 6-06-1998. After the lapse of two weeks he received letter dated 20-06-1998 which according to him was second memorandum of charges. Capt. R. Khosla alleges that the nature of charges had been considerably enlarged from the memorandum dated 05-06-1998 though he had submitted his explanation to the second show cause notice *vide* his letter dated 25-06-1998.

20. The management has refuted this charge of the applicant and has submitted that there was no enlargement of the charges and the charges levelled were simply clarified. Capt. R. Khosla has failed to satisfactorily show that there was enlargement of charges. Capt. R. Khosla has further alleged that vague charges were levelled against him of using derogatory and abusive language against the company and its seniors. A look at the charges framed in this case would show that instead of telling the exact offensive words used by Capt. R. Khosla he was conveyed that he had used unparliamentary language as mentioned in the charge sheet. It can only be imagined that decency would have prompted not to write the exact offensive words used by Capt. R. Khosla against the company and its senior officers. Capt. R. Khosla's complaint in this regard cannot be attached much weight.

Another complaint of Capt. R. Khosla is that the case of the management was presented by Mr. A.K. Trehan Advocate whereas he was forced to defend himself personally and he was not allowed representation by legal counsel or any other qualified officer. Refuting this charge, the management has contended that there was no Advocate by the name of Mr. A.K. Trehan with the management at the time of holding of the enquiry. The legal officer of the management at that time was Mr. S.K. Trehan and he never participated in the proceedings of the enquiry committee. There is absolutely no acceptable evidence on record to accept this charge of Capt. R. Khosla that the management was represented by Mr. A.K. Trehan Advocate.

Capt. R. Khosla has further alleged that Capt. GPS Grewal, GM Operation (N) was made a member of the enquiry committee even though he was extremely biased against him and was personally responsible for issuing the letters dated 05-06-1998 and 20-06-1998 containing the memorandum of charges and also placed Capt. R. Khosla under suspension and this has caused great prejudice to him. In rebuttal to the same, the management witness has

stated on oath that Capt. R. Khosla never objected to Capt. GPS Grewal becoming a member of the enquiry committee and so his allegations are after thought and concocted. It is further asserted by the management that Capt. GPS Grewal was not at all instrumental or consulted in arriving at the final conclusion/decision. There is nothing on record to show that the stand taken by the management is wrong and as such the complaint of Capt. R. Khosla in this regard cannot be attached weight.

Capt. R. Khosla has also alleged that statement of only one witness was recorded and he was not allowed opportunity to cross-examine the witness nor any opportunity was given to him to produce his defence. Refuting these charges, the management witness Mr. Gaurav Kumar has stated on oath that the applicant had himself cross-examined Capt. Romi Sharma and Mr. Sethi during the enquiry. He has denied that the statement of only one witness was recorded. It was further pointed out that at the instance of Capt. R. Khosla, Capt. Nilesh Guha and Capt. Atul Mehta were required to appear for cross-examination but for the reasons best known to Capt. R. Khosla, he refused to cross-examine them. The statement of the witnesses and their cross-examination have been exhibit marked as part of Ex. R. W.1/4. It is asserted that the enquiry committee never refused or declined any request made by the applicant for making a statement or to examine the witnesses in defence. The above levelled charges of Capt. R. Khosla thus are also not borne out from the record.

21. Capt. R. Khosla has also alleged that the findings of the committee are perverse. This charge too cannot be accepted as the findings of the committee are clearly based on evidence lead in the domestic enquiry. Capt. R. Khosla has alleged that on a trivial charge, punishment of dismissal has been given to him. Capt. R. Khosla was expected to conduct in a responsible and dignified manner and a person of his standing could not be expected to behave so loosely and irresponsibly. His plea that for a trivial charge he was given the punishment of dismissal is also not acceptable. The punishment awarded to Capt. R. Khosla cannot be said to be shockingly disproportionate to the charges levelled and proved against him.

22. In view of my above findings, Capt. R. Khosla has failed to prove his case. The claim filed by him in this case, therefore, is dismissed as he is not entitled to any relief in this case. The award is passed accordingly and the reference sent by the Govt. of India is answered as such.

Dated : 07-09-2012

SATNAM SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3124.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब नेशनल बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों

के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/179/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 03-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/93/1998-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2012

**S.O. 3124.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby published the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/179/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Nagpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management Punjab National Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 03-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/93/1998-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI J.P. CHAND, PRESIDING OFFICER,**

**CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR**

**Case No. CGIT/NGP/179/2002**

Date : 28-08-2012.

**Party No. 1** : The Regional Manager,  
Punjab National Bank,  
Kingsway, Nagpur

Versus

**Party No. 2** : Shri Yashwant Natthuji Meshram  
Rio. Hiwri Lay out, 478-Bagadganj,  
Nagpur-440 008.

#### AWARD

(Dated: 28th August, 2012)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government had referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank and their workman, Shri Yashwant Meshram, to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal- Cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur for adjudication, as per letter No. L-12012/93/98-IR (B-II) dated 20-10-1998, with the following schedule:—

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank in dismissing the services of Shri Y.N. Meshram vide their order dated 24-04-1997 is legal & justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

Subsequently, the case was transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication, in accordance with law.



2. On receipt of the reference, the parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim and written statement and accordingly, the workman, Shri Y .N. Meshram, ('the workman' in short), filed the statement of claim and the management of Punjab National Bank, ('Party No. 1' in short) filed its written statement.

The case of the workman as projected in the statement of claim is that he belongs to schedule caste community and he came to be appointed as a clerk-cum-cashier, after his due selection by the Banking Service Recruitment Board, in Punjab National Bank, Nagpur on 01-12-1984 and after completion of his probation period, he was confirmed in the services in the month of June, 1985 and in 1994, he was transferred to Hanuman Nagar Branch, Nagpur. It is further pleaded by the workman that the service conditions of the employees of the Bank are governed by the Bi-partite settlements and prior to 1997, there was no prohibition for the bank employees for participating in politics in any shape or form and also for contesting elections to legislative or other bodies and therefore, he contested the election for the post of corporator to the local body of City Municipal Corporation, Nagpur from Vardhaman Nagar ward and was elected as a corporator and after he was being elected as a corporator, the party no. 1 served a charge sheet on him on 03-03-1992 for commission of the misconduct, under clauses 19.7 and 19.7 (e) of the Bipartite settlement, on the allegation of his participating and contesting the election to the local bodies and a departmental enquiry was conducted against him for the said charges and on the basis of the enquiry report submitted by the enquiry officer, he was punished with stoppage of four increments with cumulative effect, vide order dated 13-07-1994 of party no. 1 and on 22-09-1994, he sent a representation to party no. 1 informing that he is a sitting corporator of city Municipal Corporation, Nagpur and want to contest the forthcoming election for Legislative Assembly, either independently or with cooperation of any political party and asked for permission for contesting the election to the Legislative Assembly to be held in 1994 and in response to his letter seeking permission to contest the election for legislative Assembly, party no. 1 vide letter dated 05-12-1994 informed him that in view of the staff department circulars No. 788 dated 03-04-1970, Personnel Division Circular No. 308 dated 21-12-1977 and 1376, dated 26-04-1993, he cannot be permitted to contest the election for Legislative Assembly and violation of the said guidelines, instructions would carry disciplinary action in terms of the Bank's rules and due to refusal of permission by the party no. 1, neither he contested the election nor took part in political activities, but, on 07-12-1994, he was served with a charge sheet alleging that he was indulging in politics without permission of the Bank and letter dated 22-09-1994 submitted by him for permission to contest the State Legislative Assembly election indicates that he is still interested in active political activities, which amounts to gross misconduct under clause 19.5 (e) of the Bipartite

settlement for willful insubordination and disobedience of any lawful and reasonable orders of the management and he was directed to submit his explanation within seven days showing cause as to why suitable disciplinary action would not be initiated against him and he submitted his reply to the charges vide letter dated 22-12-1994, starting that simply seeking permission to contest the election to Legislative Assembly does not constitute any misconduct nor he has committed any misconduct, but without taking into consideration of the said reply, the party no- 1 decided to hold a departmental enquiry against him and intimated him about the same vide order dated 04-04-1996 and appointed Shri K.R. Palsodkar as the enquiry officer and the departmental enquiry was posted to 31-05-1996, but the same was adjourned from 31-05-1996 to 10-06-1996 and 10-06-1996 to 18-06-1996 on his request, but as he was not intimated about the date of hearing of 18-06-1996, he could not attend the enquiry on 18-06-1996 and it appears that the enquiry was adjourned from 18-06-1996 to 27-06-1996, without giving him any information or notice about the same and since, he did not receive any information about the date of hearing of 27-06-1996, he could not attend the enquiry and from the proceedings, it appears that on 27-06-1996, the presenting officer presented the prosecution case, in his absence and the next date of hearing was fixed to 08-07-1996 and the enquiry was adjourned from 08-07-1996 to 22-07-1996 and from 22-07-1996 to 03-08-1996 and due to want of information, he did not attend the enquiry on 08-07-1996 and 22-07-1996, but he attended the enquiry on 03-08-1996 and he was informed that management had already closed their case on 22-07-1996 and he was directed to submit his defence and on his prayer, the case was adjourned to 26-08-1996 and on 26-08-1996, he submitted his defence stating that simply seeking permission for contesting the election to Legislative Assembly does not constitute "misconduct" and therefore, the charges levelled against him are vague, improper and illegal and therefore, he should be exonerated from the charges and he also submitted his written argument on 26-08-1996 and the enquiry officer submitted the enquiry report to the disciplinary authority with the finding of the charge to have been proved against him.

It is further pleaded by the workman that for contesting the election in 1992 for the post of corporator, penalty of stoppage of four increments with cumulative effect had been imposed against him, vide order dated 13-07-1994 and vide his letter dated 22-09-1994, he had requested for permission to contest the election to State Legislative Assembly and simply seeking permission to contest the election does not constitute misconduct, under clause 19.05 (e) of the Bipartite settlement and therefore, the charge was vague and the findings of the enquiry officer were not only contrary to the provisions contained in clause 19.05 (e) of the Bipartite settlement, but also, perverse and the same was not based on any material evidence and the

disciplinary authority without going through the charge sheet and provision of clause 19.05 (e) of the Bipartite settlement and with predetermination to dismiss him from services, on 19-04-1997 sent a letter intimating him that as per the Bipartite settlement, there is no provision for taking assistance of lawyer for attending personal hearing and he was given a final chance for personal hearing in the matter and for submission of his explanation on 22-04-1997 and on 22-04-1997, he submitted his show cause before the disciplinary authority in response to the show cause notice issued by the bank, but the disciplinary authority without going through the documents of the enquiry proceedings and provisions contained in the Bipartite settlement, imposed the punishment of "dismissal without notice" on 24-04-1997 and the appeal preferred by him was also dismissed by the appellate authority vide order dated 29-09-1998 and the order dated 24-04-1997 dismissing him without notice is bad and illegal and liable to be set aside and for contesting the post of corporator in Municipal Corporation, Nagpur, he had been punished with stoppage of four increments with cumulative effect and therefore, imposing a punishment for the same charges constitute a case of double jeopardy and on that ground also, the order of dismissal is liable to be set aside and the management did not produce any witness to prove the charges and failed to establish the charges and the procedure adopted by the enquiry officer in permitting the presenting officer to become a witness on behalf of the management is unprocedural and was an act of biasness and he was not given any chance to produce his defence evidence and the enquiry was conducted by violating the principles of natural justice and the enquiry was vitiated and the documents, basing on which the charges were framed were not supplied to him and the punishment imposed is malafide and illegal. The workman has prayed to set aside the order of dismissal dated 24-04-1997 and to reinstate him in service with full back wages.

3. The party no- 1 in their written statement have pleaded inter-alia that the workman came to be appointed through banking service recruitment board in the capacity of clerk-cum-cashier w.e.f. 01-12-1984 and there was general prohibition in the matter of contesting election and taking an active part in politics by the Bank employees apart from Bank's specific circulars. Personnel Division circular no-308 dated 21-12-77 and Staff Department circular no- 788 dated 03-07-1970 and the workman contested the election for the post of corporator and continued as such for a period of five years from 1992 and the workman was issued with the charge sheet on 03-03-1992 alleging that he participated in politics and contested the election of the Local bodies constituting misconduct under clauses 19.7 and 19.5 (e) of the Bipartite Settlement and for the said charges the departmental enquiry was initiated and on the basis of the enquiry report submitted by the enquiry officer, punishment of stoppage of four increments with cumulative

effect was passed against the workman vide order dated 13-07-1994 and on 22-09-1994, the workman informed the management that he is a sitting corporator of Nagpur Municipal corporation and he also sought permission to contest the Legislative Assembly Election either independently or with cooperation of political party and the submission of the representation dated 22-09-1994 itself was sufficient to establish that the workman was in active politics, as he was a sitting corporator on the day of representation dated 22-09-1994 and since the workman was a sitting corporator, he was actively involved in political activities and the workman was issued with charge sheet dated 07-12-1994 on the allegation that he was indulging in politics without permission of the management and the application submitted by the workman for permission to contest the election to Legislative Assembly election indicated that he was still interested in active political activities amounting to gross misconducts under clause 19-5 (e) of the Bipartite Settlement and the workman submitted his reply on 22-12-1994 and after considering his reply, the departmental enquiry was ordered and the enquiry was fixed to 31-05-1996 and on that date, the workman remained absent not for the reason that he was out of station, but on the ground that the documents of the enquiry were in English language and he is unable to understand English language and such facts were intimated by him by his letter dated 30-05-1996 and the workman also remained absent on 10-06-1996 to which date the enquiry was adjourned, on the ground of the marriage of his brother and the workman by his letter dated 08-06-1996, had requested for adjournment of the enquiry proceedings, so the enquiry was adjourned to 18-06-1996 and a copy of the proceeding was sent to the workman for his record, but on 18-06-1996 also, the workman remained absent in the enquiry and telephonically requested the enquiry officer to adjourn the enquiry on the ground of non-receipt of the copies of the enquiry proceedings dated 10-06-1996 and due to such request, the enquiry officer adjourned the enquiry to 27-06-1996 and the workman consented to that date on the telephone itself and the proceedings of the enquiry were sent to the workman and as on 27-06-1996 also, the workman remained absent, the enquiry officer decided to go ahead with the departmental enquiry against the workman and the presenting officer on 27-06-1996 presented his case in absence of the workman and the date of hearing was fixed to 08-07-1996 and on 08-07-1996 also, the workman did not attend the enquiry and made a written request to adjourn the enquiry on the ground of his attending the general meeting of Nagpur Municipal corporation, which was to be held on 08-07-1996 itself and over phone, the workman requested to fix the next date of the enquiry to 22-07-1996 and as per the request made by the workman, the enquiry proceedings were adjourned to 22-07-1996 and on 22-07-1996, the workman attended the enquiry and requested for time to collect documents to be submitted in

his defence, so the enquiry officer adjourned the enquiry to 03-08-1996 for submission of documents in defence and on 03-08-1996, the workman presented a list of documents and the enquiry was then adjourned to 19-08-1996 and 19-08-1996, the workman did not submit his defence as agreed, so the enquiry was adjourned to 26-08-1996 and on 26-08-1996, the workman attended the enquiry and submitted his statement in his defence and the enquiry was completed on 26-08-1996 and with the consent of both the parties, the enquiry was closed and vide disciplinary authority's order dated 13-07-1994, the workman was advised to refrain from taking part in politics and political activities with immediate effect and he committed breach of the direction given by the competent authority and therefore, he was issued with the charge sheet dated 07-12-1994 and the misconduct alleged against the workman was not that he sought permission to contest the election, but the charge was that the workman remained in active politics by keeping the post of corporator and therefore, the charge sheet was issued and the charge sheet was not at all vague and the enquiry was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and as per the Bipartite settlement, there is no provision to allow the workman to be assisted by a lawyer, while giving personal hearing on the issue of punishment and the punishment order was passed against the workman after considering the service record, extenuating the aggravating circumstances of the enquiry proceedings and the punishment of dismissal as per order dated 24-04-1997 does not amount to double jeopardy and the earlier charge against the workman was about contesting the election of Nagpur Municipal Corporation, Nagpur and the charge dated 07.12. 1994 was that the workman remained in active politics inspite of instructions given to him by higher authorities and the charges levelled against the workman were very much clear and differ from each other and no fault can be found with the enquiry proceedings, if no witness was examined in support of the case and the documentary evidence was sufficient to establish the charges against the workman and the presenting officer was not examined as a witness and he merely apprised the enquiry officer about the documentary evidence on record and closed the case of the management and the enquiry proceedings were sent to the workman from time to time, where in, the next dates of the enquiry were mentioned specifically and the final outcome of the enquiry was after the participation of the workman and the charges against the workman have been established on the basis of the documentary evidence and the workman never applied for or made a request to the enquiry officer to allow him to bring his witness and he was supplied with the relevant documents and he did not demand any document during the course of the enquiry and full opportunity was given to him to defend himself and the workman is not entitled to any relief.

4. As this is a case of dismissal of the workman from services, after holding a departmental enquiry, the validity of the departmental enquiry was taken as a preliminary issue for consideration and by order dated 07-09-2011, the departmental enquiry was held to be legal, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice.

5. At the time of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the workman that after the appointment of the workman as a clerk-cum-cashier on 01-12-1984, he was working sincerely and honestly without any stigma in his service record and his services were appreciated by the authorities of the Bank and in 1992, the workman contested the election of Nagpur Municipal Corporation and was elected as a corporator and the Bank issued a charge sheet against him for the same and after enquiry, punishment of stoppage of four increments with cumulative effect was imposed against him by order dated 13-07-1994 and on 22-09-1994, the workman submitted an application seeking permission to contest the Legislative Assembly election, but such permission was not given by the Bank and Bank intimated the workman about such refusal vide letter dated 05-12-1994 and as permission was not accorded, the workman did not contest the election, but to the surprise of the workman, a charge sheet was issued against him on 07-12-1994, on the allegation of taking part in active politics without permission of the Bank and disobedience of any lawful and reasonable orders of the management amounting to gross misconduct under clause 19.5 (e) of the Bipartite settlement and the workman submitted his reply on 22-12-1994 stating that simply seeking permission to contest the election does not constitute any misconduct and the workman did not commit any misconduct by expressing his desire to do an act, which was not forbidden by any law and he was already warned by the Bank that in case of contesting the Assembly Election, disciplinary action would be taken against him and since, he was warned, he did not contest the election, so there was no question of commission of the misconduct, for which punishment of dismissal from service was imposed against him and the punishment of dismissal from services is too harsh and disproportionate to the gravity of the misconduct and he had already been given the punishment of warning of initiation of disciplinary action, in case of contesting the election and imposition of punishment of dismissal from services again is double jeopardy and the punishment is illegal and the workman is entitled to reinstatement in service with continuity and full back wages.

6. Per contra, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the management that there was general prohibition in the matter of contesting election and taking active part in politics by the Bank employee apart from Bank's specific circulars, Staff Department Circular No. 788 dated 03-04-1970 and Personnel Division Circular No. 308 dated 21-12-1977 and inspite of such prohibition, the workman contested the election for the post of corporator of Nagpur Municipal



Corporation and was elected as a corporator and for that a charge sheet dated 03.03.1992 under clause 19.7 and 19.5 (e) of the Bipartite settlement was submitted against him on the allegation of his participation in politics and contesting the election of the local bodies and for the said charges, a departmental enquiry was initiated and on the basis of the enquiry report, punishment of stoppage of four increments with cumulative effect was imposed against him and he was directed by the competent authority to restrain himself to take part in political activities with immediate effect, as per order dated 13-07-1994 and in spite of such direction, the workman submitted an application on 22-09-1994 seeking permission to contest the election to the Legislative Assembly intimating that he was still continuing as a corporator of Nagpur Municipal Corporation and the Bank refused such permission and intimated the workman about such refusal vide letter dated 05-12-1994 with further instruction that in case of contesting the election, disciplinary action would be taken against him and the charge sheet dated 07-12-1994 submitted against the workman was not for seeking permission to contest the election to the Legislative Assembly, but for the reason that he was actively involved in politics by remaining as a corporator of Nagpur Municipal Corporation in disobedience of the direction issued by the competent authority to restrain himself from active politics and the charge was well proved against him in the departmental enquiry by production of documentary evidence and the fairness of the departmental enquiry has already been answered in favour of the Bank and the findings of the enquiry officer are based on the evidence produced in the enquiry and the same are not perverse and there is no question of any double jeopardy and the punishment imposed against the workman is not shockingly disproportionate and there is no ground to interfere with the punishment and the workman is not entitled to any relief.

7. On perusal of the materials on record including the charge sheet dated 07-12-1994, it is found that the charge sheet submitted against the workman was not for seeking permission for contesting the Legislative Assembly Election, but for willful in subordination and disobedience of lawful and reasonable order of the management, on the allegation that though by order dated 13-07-1994, he was advised to refrain from taking part from political activities with immediate effect, he did not desist from taking part in political activities. The charge levelled against the workman were not vague and the same was very specific.

It is also found that the representing officer appointed by the Bank in the departmental enquiry was not examined as a witness in the enquiry, but he presented the case of the management and explained as to how the documents produced prove the misconduct against the workman. It is also found that the findings of the enquiry officer are based

on the evidence produced in the enquiry and he has assigned reasons in support of his findings. In his show cause, the workman has admitted about his continuance as a corporator of Nagpur Municipal Corporation, in spite of the order of punishment imposed against him by order dated 13.07.1994 and the instruction of the Bank to refrain from active political activities. Hence, the findings of the enquiry officer cannot be said to be perverse. Intimation as given by the Bank to the workman about facing of disciplinary action in case of contesting the election for Legislative Assembly cannot be said to be a punishment for any misconduct, so there is no question of any double jeopardy against the workman. The punishment of dismissal from services has been imposed against the workman for commission of grave misconduct, which has been proved against him in a properly conducted departmental enquiry. The punishment imposed against the workman cannot be said to be shockingly disproportionate, calling for any interference. From the facts and circumstances of the case and the discussions made above, it is found that there is no force in the contentions raised by the learned advocate for the workman. Hence, it is ordered :—

#### ORDER

The action of the management of Punjab National Bank in dismissing the services of Shri Y. N. Meshram vide their order dated 24.04.1997 is legal and justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

J. P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ.3125.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/87/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 03.09.2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/40/1994-आईआर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2012

**S.O. 3125.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/87/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Nagpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of UCO Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 03.09.2012.

[No. L-12012/40/1994-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

**ANNEXURE****BEFORE SHRI J.P. CHAND. PRESIDING  
OFFICER, CGIT -CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
NAGPUR**

CASE No. CGIT/NGP/87/2003 DATE : 30.08.2012

**Party No. 1:** The Divisional Manager,  
UCO Bank, Divisional Office, 108,  
Sushil Bhavan,  
Balraj Marg, Dhantoli,  
Nagpur-4400 12.

**Versus**

**Party No. 2** Shri Sudesh Damari Saha,  
C/o. Shri D.K. Badola, New Majri  
Colliery, PO : Shivajinagar,  
Distt. Chandrapur (MS)

**AWARD**

(Dated: 30th August, 2012)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government had referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of UCO Bank and their workman, Shri Sudesh Damari Saha, for adjudication to CGIT-Cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as per letter No. L-12012/40/94-IR (B-II) dated 28-04-1994, with the following schedule :—

"Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank, New Majri Branch in terminating the service of Shri Sudesh Damari Saha, temporary sub-staff w.e.f. 21-11-91 is justified? If not, what relief is the said workman entitled to?"

Subsequently, the case was transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication, in accordance with law.

2. On receipt of the reference, the parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim and written statement and accordingly, the workman, Shri Sudesh Saha, ('the workman' in short), filed the statement of claim and the management of UCO Bank, ("Party No.1" in short) filed its written statement.

The case of the workman as projected in the statement of claim is that the party no. 1 is a nationalized bank and the service conditions of the employees are governed by the provisions of Bipartite Settlements and the circulars issued from the Head office to regulate the provisions of service conditions, which could not be covered in the Bipartite settlement and vide circular no. CHO/PAS/4/90 dated 31-03-1990, Head office of the Bank made it clear that persons who are engaged on daily wage basis in the branches would be absorbed in permanent employment of the Bank depending upon the workload of the Branch and he was initially appointed on 26-07-1989 @ Rs. 15/- per day

at New Majri Branch and worked as such till 20-11-1991, the date on which he was illegally terminated by party no. 1 and he was not paid wages for Sundays and Holidays and was put to hard labour beyond office hours and he was removed from employment without assigning any reason and after his removal, another daily wager came to be appointed and as he was unauthorisedly and illegally terminated from services, he raised an industrial dispute before the ALC (C), Chandrapur and before the ALC, the party no.1 took the plea that though there is an agreement under Section 2 (p) of the Act between the union and the management to absorb all the persons, who are working on daily wages, the workman could not be absorbed, as he had not applied for the same and he did not know about the said settlement and the Manager of New Majri Branch had also not intimated him about such settlement and he had submitted number of applications for permanent appointment and as such, party no.1 is precluded from taking such a plea and as he worked continuously with party no. 1 for 28 months from 26-07-1989 to 20-11-1991, which has been admitted by party no. 1, he is entitled to be absorbed in the Bank permanently as a peon.

The further case of the workman is that the party no.1 did not enter his name in the muster roll, although admittedly he worked for the period from 26-07-1989 to 20-11-1991 and the said Act is in violation of Section 25-D of the Act and even if, it is presumed that there is a procedure for appointment, it was the duty of party no. 1 to inform him about the said procedure and to get the formalities completed, but by not doing so, the party no. 1 adopted an illegal procedure of terminating him from services, hence the impugned termination is liable to be quashed and set aside.

The workman has prayed to quash and set aside the order dated 20.11.1991 and to reinstate him in service with continuity and full back wages.

3. The party no. 1 in their written statement have pleaded *inter-alia* that the circular dated 31-03-1990 was in relation to the absorption of the persons working on daily wages basis in permanent employment of UCO Bank, but the workman was never appointed as an employee by them at any point of time, so there was no question of issuing any order of termination and there was no relation of employer and employee between them and the workman. The further case of the party no. 1 is that the workman was doing the work of cleaning, sweeping and dusting etc. in the branch, for about two to three hours per day and not more than that and he was being paid for the work done by him and the payment was not on account of salary as contended and as the workman was not an employee of the Bank, there was no question of paying wages for Sundays and Holidays and the workman does not fall within the scope and ambit of the entitlement fixed by the settlements dated 31-03-1990 and the present proceeding is not maintainable and the workman is not entitled for any relief.



4. Besides placing reliance on documentary evidence, both the parties led oral evidence in support of their respective claims.

The workman has examined himself as a witness in support of his claim. The examination-in-chief of the workman is on affidavit. In his examination-in-chief, the workman has reiterated the facts mentioned in the statement of claim.

In the cross-examination, though several questions have been put to the workman regarding the hours for which he was working in the bank and about the wages paid to him, no challenge was made regarding his evidence that he worked continuously in New Majri Branch of the Bank from 26-07-1989 to 20-11-1991. It is necessary to mention here that in the written statement also, party no. 1 have not denied the claim of the workman that he worked continuously from 26-07-1989 to 20-11-1991.

One Deepak Gangaram Hadekar has been examined as a witness on behalf of party no. 1. In his examination-in-chief, which is on affidavit, this witness has reiterated the facts mentioned in the written statement. However, in the cross-examination, this witness has admitted that when the workman was engaged in the New Majri Branch, he was not working in the said branch and he was also not working in the said branch, when the services of the workman was terminated.

5. At the time of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the workman that it is clear from the evidence on record and the pleadings of the parties that the workman worked continuously from 26-07-1989 till 20-11-1991 at New Majri Branch of the Bank on daily wages and though the Bank formulated a policy to regularize all the daily wagers in permanent employment, the workman was not regularized and there are vacancies of the post of peons in the Bank and without compliance of the mandatory provisions of the Act, the workman was terminated from services on 20-11-1991 and as such, the termination is illegal and the workman is entitled for reinstatement in service with continuity and full back wages.

6. Per contra, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the party no. 1 that the workman was never appointed as an employee of the Bank and as such, there is no question of termination of the workman and there was no relationship of employer and employee between the Bank and the workman and the workman was engaged for doing the working cleaning, sweeping and dusting etc. in the branch for about 2 to 3 hours daily and he was paid for the work done by him and as the workman was never an employee of the Bank, there was no question of his illegal termination from services and the engagement of the workman was not in accordance with the norms and procedure prescribed by the Bank for appointment in the Bank and such engagement was done by the Branch Manager, who had no authority to do so and as such, the

workman has no right to seek regularisation in service and the workman is not entitled to any relief.

In support of such contentions, the learned advocate for the party no. 1 has relied on the decision reported in AIR 2006 SC-1806 (Secretary, State of Karnataka & Others Vs. Umadevi & Others).

7. The workman has claimed that as per circular No. CHO/PAS/4/90 dated 31-03-1990, he is entitled for absorption in permanent employment in the Bank. The party no.1 has pleaded that the said circular has no application to the case of the workman. In view of such denial, the burden was upon the workman to show that he was entitled for absorption permanently as per the circular mentioned above. However, the workman neither produced nor proved the said circular to show that he was entitled for absorption in permanent employment in the Bank. Hence, it is held that the workman has failed to prove that he is entitled for absorption in permanent employment of the Bank, on the basis of circular dated 31-03-1990.

8. The further case of the workman is that though he worked from 26-07-1989 to 20-11-1991 continuously at New Majri Branch of the Bank at the rate of Rs. 15 per day, he was removed from employment by the Manager without assigning any reason and as such, the termination of his services was illegal. Party no.1 has denied the claim of the workman. According to party no.1, the workman was engaged by the Manager of the Branch for two to three hours per day to do the work of cleaning, sweeping and dusting etc. and the workman was never an employee of the Bank and there was no relationship of employer and employee between them and the workman, so there was no question of termination of the services of the workman.

9. At this juncture, I think it apposite to mention that the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court as reported in AIR 2006 SC-1806 (Supra) is in regard to public employment and the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that, "Appointment de hors due process of selection envisaged by constitutional scheme confers no right on appointee." However, the issue of termination of the services of an employee in violation of the mandatory provisions of section 25-F of the Act was not for consideration before the Hon'ble Apex Court in the said decision. Hence, with respect, I am of the view that the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court as reported in AIR 2006 SC-1806 (Supra) has no application to the present case in hand.

10. Section 2 (s) of the Act defines the term "Workman". It is well settled by a number of decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court that Section 2 (s) of the Act contains an exhaustive definition of the term "workman" and the source of employment, the method of recruitment, the terms and conditions of employment/contract of service, the quantum of wages/pay and the mode of payment are not at all relevant for deciding whether or not a person is a workman

within the meaning of section 2 (s) of the Act and the definition of workman also does not make any distinction between full time and part time employee or a person appointed on contract basis and there is nothing in the plain language of section 2 (s) from which it can be inferred that only a person employed on a regular basis or a person employed for doing whole time job is a workman and the one employed on temporary, part time or contract basis on fixed wages or as a casual employee or for doing duty for fixed hours is not a workman.

It is also well settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court that even daily rated worker is entitled to the protection of section 25-F of the Act, if he had worked continuously for a period of one year or more.

11. In the case in hand, it is not disputed by the party no. 1 that the workman worked on daily wages from 26-07-1989 to 20-11-1991. It is clear from the materials on record that the workman worked for more than 240 days in the preceding 12 calendar months of the date of termination of his services *i.e.* 20-11-1991. So, the workman was entitled for the protection of the provision of section 25-F of the Act and he was entitled for one month's notice or one month's pay in lieu of notice and retrenchment compensation, before termination of his services. Admittedly, the mandatory provisions of section 25-F of the Act were not complied with by party no. 1, before termination of the services of the workman and as such, the termination of the services of the workman amounts retrenchment. As the termination of the services of the workman was done without compliance of the mandatory provisions of section 25-F of the Act, the termination is hold to be illegal.

12. Now, the only question remains for consideration is as to what relief or reliefs the workman is entitled.

From the materials on record, it is clear that the engagement of the workman by party no. 1 was purely on daily wages basis and such engagement was not in accordance with the norms. and prescribed procedure of appointment in the Bank of party no.1. The engagement of the workman as daily wager by party no. 1 was on 26-07-1989. His engagement continued for about two years and four months *i.e.* up to 20-11-1991.

Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the present case in hand, I think it apropos to mention about the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in 2010(8) SCALE-583 (Incharge Officer and Another Vs. Shankar Shetty), which is squarely applicable to this case.

In the said decision, the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that,

"Industrial Disputes Act 1947/Section 25F/Daily wager / Termination of service in violation of section 25(F)/ Award of monetary compensation in lieu of reinstatement/ Respondent was initially engaged as daily wager by appellants in 1978/His engagement continued for about 7 years intermittently up to 06-09-85/ Respondent raised industrial dispute relating to his retrenchment alleging

violation of procedure prescribed in sec. 25(F) of the Act/Labour Court rejected respondents claim: holding that section 25(F) of the Act was not attracted since the workman failed to prove that he had worked continuously for 40 days in the calendar year preceding his termination 06-09-85. On appeal, High Court directed reinstatement of Respondent into service holding that termination of respondent was illegal-Whether an order of reinstatement will automatically follow in a case where engagement of a daily wager has been brought to an end in violation of section 25(F) of the Act-Allowing the appeal-held:

The High Court erred in granting relief of reinstatement to the respondent. The respondent was engaged as daily wager in 1978 and his engagement continued for about 7 year intermittently up to September 6, 1985 *i.e.* about 25 years back. In a case such as the present one it appears to us that relief of reinstatement cannot be justified and instead monetary compensation would meet the ends of justice. In our considered opinion the compensation of rupees one lakh (Rs. 1,00,000) in lieu of reinstatement shall be appropriate, just and equitable".

The principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Apex Court as mentioned above are squarely applicable to the present case at hand. Applying the said principles, it appears to me that a relief of reinstatement is not justified in this case and instead monetary compensation would meet the ends of justice. In my considered opinion compensation of Rs. 30,000/- (Rupees thirty thousand) in lieu of reinstatement shall be appropriate, just an equitable. Hence it is ordered.

### ORDER

The action of the management of UCO Bank, New Majri Branch in terminating the service of Shri Sudesh Damari Saha, temporary sub-staff w.e.f. 21-11-91 is unjustified. The workman is entitled for monetary compensation of Rs. 30,000 in lieu of reinstatement. He is not entitled for any other relief.

The party no.1 is directed to pay the compensation of Rs. 30,000 to the workman within one month from the date of Publication of the award in the official gazette.

J. P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3126.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/324/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 03-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-17012/28/1995-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2012

**S.O. 3126.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/324/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, NAGPUR now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION OF INDIA and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 03-09-2012.

[No. L-17012/28/1995-IR(B-II)]  
SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

# ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI J.P. CHAND, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CGIT -CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR**

**CASE No. CGIT/NGP/324/2000**

Date: 17-08-2012.

**Party No. 1 :** The Divisional Officer,  
Life Insurance Corporation of India,  
Division Office, National Insurance  
Bldg. S.V. Patel Road, P.B. No. 63,  
Nagpur-440001.

# Versus

**Applicant :** Shri Valmik S/o. Shri Shivaji Bansod,  
R/o. Chandre (Malipar), Tahsil and Distt.  
Bhandara (Maharashtra).

# AWARD

(Dated: 17th August, 2012)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government had referred the industrial dispute to Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Jabalpur for adjudication, between the employers, in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India and their workman, Shri Valmik Bansod, as per letter No. L-17012/28/95-IR (B-II) dated 04-03-1997, with the following schedule :-

"Whether the action of the management of Life Insurance Corporation, of India, Divisional Office, Nagpur in terminating the services of Shri Valmik, Development Officer, is proper, legal & justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

Subsequently, the case was transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication in accordance with law.

2. On receipt of the reference, the parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim and written statement and accordingly, the applicant, Shri Valmik

Bansod, ('the workman" in short), filed the statement of claim and the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, ("Party No. 1" in short) filed their written statement.

The case of the applicant as presented in the statement of claim is that he was appointed as a development officer on 28-03-1988 as per the terms and conditions of appointment of the Life Insurance Corporation of India ("LIC" in short) and initially, he was paid the stipend of Rs. 1200 per month and during the period from 23-03-1988 to 25-05-1988 and 28-05-1988 to 28-06-1988, he completed all the required trainings and on 28-06-1988, he was deputed to look after the field work and Arjuni (Morgaon) was fixed as his headquarters and Arjuni (Morgaon) was under the jurisdiction of Lakhandur and Sakoli and he worked as a probationary officer for a period of one year and he achieved the business target given by party no. 1 during the said period and he gave the best possible result to party no. 1 and the original records of the business done by him are in the custody and possession of party no. 1 and the period from 01-10-1988 to 30-09-1989 was considered as his probation period and even after completion of his probation period, his performance was very satisfactory and was as per the target/ estimates given by party no. 1 and he also achieved 100% business as per the estimate given by party no. 1 and the Branch Manager of Sakoli Branch made false representation and submitted false report about his performance to party no. 1, as a result of which, party no. 1 terminated his services w.e.f. 28-05-1990 and during the period from 28-03-1988 to 28-05-1990, he had competed more than 180 days of work, as required under law and no show cause notice was issued before the termination of his services and without giving him any chance of hearing and without observing the principles of natural justice, his services were terminated by party no. 1 and though he filed an appeal before the Zonal Manager, his appeal was rejected by the Zonal Manager without granting him any opportunity of being heard and the appeal preferred by him on 29-08-1992 before the Chairman of LIC was also rejected on 20-08-1994, without giving him any chance of hearing and being aggrieved by such order, he approached the Central Industrial Labour Commissioner, Nagpur and at that time, he came to know that as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of S.K. Verma Vs. Mahesh Chandra reported in AIR 1984 SC-1462, Development Officers of LIC are coming under the definition of "workmen", but in a full bench judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in AIR 1994-2608, it was held that the earlier judgment was a judgment of per incuriam and the development officer does not come under the purview of "workman" and he filed the writ petition bearing no. 2302/96 before the Hon'ble Apex Court, Nagpur Bench for setting aside the order passed on 19-09-1990 and he became a victim of colourable exercise of power by party no.1.

The applicant has prayed for his reinstatement in service with continuity and full back wages.



The party no. 1 in the written statement have pleaded inter-alia that Life Insurance Corporation (Staff) Regulations 1960 ("the Regulations" in short) which govern the terms and conditions of service of their employees are statutory in nature and prevail over the provisions of the Act, in case of any conflict relating to the terms and conditions of employment and Regulation 14 of the Regulations provides the procedure for appointment on probation and discharge of the probationer from service without any notice, during the period of probation and such termination based on Regulation 14(4) has been upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *M. Venugopal, Divisional Manager Vs. LIC* reported in AIR 1994 SC 1343 and *LIC & Anr. Vs. Raghavendra Sheshagirirao Kulkarni*, AIR 1998 SC-327 and the workman was appointed as a Development Officer on probation w.e.f. 01-10-1988 vide letter dated 06-12-1988 and the appointment order shows that the probation period of the applicant was initially for a period of 12 months, which could be extended for a further period of 12 months at the discretion of the corporation and the appointment of the applicant as a probationary Development Officer was governed by the Regulations and therefore, his termination was excluded by Section 2 (oo) (bb) of the Act. The further case of the party no. 1 is that the workman has filed writ petition no. 2302/96 before the Hon'ble High Court, Nagpur Bench, challenging the action of the corporation in terminating his services by its order dated 19-09-1990 and prayed for setting aside the said order and the petition was admitted on 03-12-1997 and the writ petition is pending for final disposal and in order to avoid any conflicting order between the Hon'ble High Court and the Tribunal, the reference was required to be rejected.

The further case of the party no. 1 is that the applicant was initially appointed as an apprentice Development Officer for a period of one year commencing from 28-03-1988 on a stipend of Rs. 1250 per month and after completion of the apprenticeship, the applicant came to be appointed as a probationary Development Officer w.e.f. 01-10-1988 vide letter dated 06-12-1988 and the performance of the applicant was not satisfactory and he did not fulfill the minimum performance norms set out for confirmation as laid down in his appointment letter and as such, the probation period was extended as a special case for a further period of 12 months commencing from 01-10-1989 to 30-09-1990 and the statements as regard to the achievement of the business target set out for the period from 01-10-1989 to 30-09-1990 as mentioned in the statement of claim are incorrect and the actual performance of the applicant fell much short to the standard norms prescribed and he was also given a notice informing him about his poor performance and since the applicant failed to improve his performance, in spite of the notice, his services came to be terminated by order dated 19-09-1990, before the period of the extended probationary period which was to be expired on 30-09-1990 and such termination does not amount

to any punishment nor it does cast any stigma on the probationer and as such, there was no requirement of giving any opportunity to the applicant of being heard and the appellate authority correctly declined to interfere with the order of termination and they were justified in terminating the services of the applicant in accordance with clause 14 (4) of the Regulations and the applicant is not entitled to any relief.

4. Before delving into the merit of the matter, I think it necessary to mention here that from the copy of the order dated 05-02-2009, passed by the Hon'ble Court in writ petition no. 2303/1996, it is found that the applicant was allowed to withdraw the writ petition and the writ petition was disposed of accordingly.

5. Besides placing reliance on documentary evidence, both the parties adduced oral evidence in support of their respective claims. The applicant has examined himself as a witness in support of his case. One Jiban Gopal Maity was examined as a witness on behalf of party no. 1.

6. In his examination-in-chief, which is on affidavit, the applicant has reiterated the facts mentioned in the statement of claim. However, in the cross-examination, the applicant has admitted that he was appointed as a probationary Development Officer, class-II and an appointment letter Ext. M -I was issued by the LIC and he accepted the terms and conditions mentioned in the appointment letter and joined his duty and in paragraph 2 of his appointment letter, it was mentioned that he shall be on probation for a period of 12 months from the date of his joining duties as a probationer and his probationary period can be extended for not exceeding 24 months and he shall be liable to be discharged from service of the corporation without any notice and without any cause being assigned. The applicant has further admitted that in paragraph 5 of his appointment letter, his duties and obligations were mentioned and according to paragraph 10 of his appointment letter, he was to do minimum 50 Lacs competed Life Insurance Business, 250 Life Insurance policies through the agents recruited by him and the Senior Divisional Manager issued the letter dated 05-01-1989, Ext. M-II regarding his performance for the first year and he had received the said letter and he did not give any reply to the said letter and as he was not able to reach the minimum performance norms set out by the corporation in the first year of his probation, his probation period was extended as a special case for another one year, as per letter dated, 21-11-1989 of the Sr. Divisional Manager, Ext. M -III and in the said letter, revised target for the period from 01-10-1989 to 30-09-1990 was prescribed.

7. The evidence of the witness examined on behalf of the party no. 1 is also on affidavit. In his examination-in-chief, this witness has reiterated the facts mentioned in the written statement. This witness has also proved the letter addressed by the Branch Manager on 14-02-1990 to the

applicant regarding his business activities, the copy of the letter addressed to the applicant by the Manager (Sales) dated 28-08-1990 regarding his business performance and copy of letter dated 19-09-1990 issued by the sub Divisional Manager to the applicant regarding his performance during the probationary period from 01-10-1989 to 31-08-1990 as Exts. M-VII, M-VIII and M-IX respectively. In his cross-examination, this witness has denied the suggestion that the applicant had achieved the business of Rs. 50,00,000 as fixed by the company in the first year of his service as probationary Development Officer. Though this witness has been cross-examined at length, nothing of substance has been brought out in the cross-examination to disbelieve him.

8. At the time of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the applicant that the applicant was appointed as a Development Officer for a period of one year on 27-03-1988 as per the standing rules and regulations and he completed the two month's training period from 28-03-1988 to 28-05-1988 on a monthly stipend of Rs. 1200 per months and on 28-06-1988, he was deputed to look after the field work of Arjuni (Morgaon) and the applicant achieved more than 100% business and the Branch Office gave a false report stating 'that the applicant was able to achieve only 84.75% of target and such facts have been clearly established from the evidence on record including the evidence of the applicant and 'the applicant was terminated from services by the party no. 1 on 28-09-1990, without giving any opportunity of hearing and in violation of the principles of natural justice and the appeal preferred by the applicant was also rejected without giving him any opportunity of being heard and the termination of the applicant was purely on vindictiveness and based on false report and due to such illegal termination, the applicant is entitled for reinstatement in service with full back wages.

9. Per contra, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the party no. 1 that the reference is ab-initio invalid and is not maintainable, as the applicant is not a workman and the applicant himself has pleaded in the statement of claim that the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that "Development Officer" of LIC is not a workman and as such, the reference is to be answered against the workman.

It was further submitted by the learned advocate for the Party No.1 that the applicant was appointed as an apprentice Development Officer for one year commencing from 28-03-1988 on a stipend of Rs. 1250 per month and after completion of the apprenticeship, he came to be appointed as a probationary Development Officer w.e.f. 01-10-1988 and the performance of the applicant was not satisfactory and he could not able to fulfill the minimum performance norms set out for confirmation as laid down in his appointment letter and as such, his probation period was extended as a special case for a further period of 12 months commencing from 01-10-1989 and the applicant failed to improve his performance in spite of issuance of

notice to him and as his actual performance fell much short to the standard norms prescribed, his services came to be terminated on 19-09-1990 and such termination did not amount to any punishment or cast any stigma on the applicant and the termination of the applicant was in accordance with clause 14(4) of the Staff Regulations and as such, the applicant is not entitled to any relief.

In support of such contentions, the learned advocate for the Party No.1 placed reliance on the decisions reported in AIR 1994 S.C. 1343 (M. Venugopal Vs. The Divisional Manager, LIC), AIR 1998 SC-327 (LIC Vs. Raghavendra Seshagiri) and AIR 1994 SC-2608 (HR. Adyanthaya Vs. Sandoz Ltd).

10. First of all, the issue as to whether the applicant is a workman as per the definition of Section 2(S) of the Act is required to be considered. In this connection, it is necessary to mention here that the applicant in the statement of claim itself has mentioned that though in the decision reported in AIR 1984 SC -1462 (Supra), it was held by the Hon'ble Apex Court that Development Officers of LIC are workmen within the meaning of the Act, the Hon 'ble Apex Court in the decision reported in AIR 1994 SC-2608 (Supra) directed to treat the decision reported in AIR 1984 -1462 as "as per incuriam".

From the above pleadings of the applicant, it is clear that the applicant knew that Development Officer of LIC is not a workman within the meaning of the Act.

Moreover, in the decision reported in AIR 1994 SC -. 2608 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court after referring to the earlier decision reported in AIR 1984 SC-1462 have held that, "Development Officer of LIC is not a workman as per the definition of the Act and the decision reported in AIR 1984 SC-1462 (Supra) be treated as a decision of "as per incuriam".

So applying the principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the decision reported in AIR 1994 SC-2608 (Supra), to the present case in hand, it is held that the applicant, who was admittedly appointed as a Development Officer on probation was not a workman and as such, the reference is not maintainable.

11. On perusal of the evidence on record, both documentary and oral, it is found that as per the document, Ext. M-I, the applicant was appointed as Probationary Development Officer w.e.f. 01-10-1988 with the conditions that he shall be on probation initially for a period of 12 months from the date of his joining duties and the corporation may, in its sole discretion, extend his probationary period, which shall not exceed 24 months counted from the commencement of the probationary appointment and during the probationary period (which includes extended probationary period if applicable) he shall be liable to be discharged from service of the corporation without any notice and without any cause



being assigned. It is also found from record that the applicant accepting the terms and conditions given in the appointment letter, Ext. M-I joined in service. It is found from Ext. M-III that as the applicant was not able to achieve the minimum target fixed in regard to his performance and for that his probationary period was extended for another 12 months commencing from 01-10-1989 as a special case, with the same service conditions as mentioned in Ext. M-I and he was also given revised target of performance during the extended period of probation. It is also clear from the evidence on record that as the applicant was not able to reach the target fixed by the Party No.1, the applicant was dismissed from services as per orders dated 19-09-1990, i.e. before the expiry of the extended period of probationary period.

12. At this juncture, I think it necessary to mention about the principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the decisions reported in AIR 1994 SC-1343 (Supra) and AIR 1998 SC-327 (Supra).

In the decision reported in AIR 1994 SC-1343 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that :—

“(A) Life Insurance Corporation Act (31 of 1956), S.48(2)(cc), sub section 2(c) -Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations (1960), Regn. 14 -Probationer - Termination of services -Non-compliance of S. 25F of Industrial Disputes Act-Validity-Contract of employment entitling Corporation not to confirm probationer in case he fails to achieve target fixed in regard to his performance - Termination effected thereof without any notice -Cannot be assailed on ground of non-compliance of S.25F -Such termination being effected under stipulation contained in contract read with Regn. 14 is not 'retrenchment' within S. 2 (oo) of Industrial Disputes Act-Even otherwise regulations framed u/s. 48(2)(cc) have overriding effect over provisions of Industrial Disputes Act.”

13. In the decision reported in AIR 1998 SC-327 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that :—

“Life Insurance Corporation Act (31 of 1956), S. 48 (2-A) (as amended by 1981 Act) -Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations (1960), Regn. 14(4) - Termination of service -Appointment on probation - Letter of appointment stipulating discharge from service without notice or reasons - Termination cannot be held to be bad on ground of failure of Corporation to give opportunity of hearing -Termination also would not amount to retrenchment within S. 2(oo) of Industrial Disputes Act.

14. The principles as enunciated in the two decisions mentioned above squarely applicable to the present case in hand. So, applying the said principles to the present case in hand, it is found that the applicant was a probationer and he failed to achieve the target fixed in regard to his performance and as such, he was dismissed from services. Such termination was effected under stipulation contained

in the contract read with regulation 14 of the Regulations and as such, the same is not retrenchment within Section 2(oo) of the Act and the dismissal of the workman from services was for failure to achieve necessary target stipulated in contract of employment. Hence, it is ordered :—

### ORDER

The action of the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Divisional Office, Nagpur in terminating the services of Shri Valmik, Development Officer, is proper, legal and justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

J. P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3127.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अहिंसा/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 13/2009) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 06-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

[सं. एल-12012/70/2008-आई. आर. (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th September, 2012

**S.O. 3127.**— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 13/2009) of the Central Government Industrial tribunal/Labour Court, Kanpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 06-9-2012.

[No. L-12012/70/2008-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

### ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SRI RAM PARKASH, HJS,  
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
KANPUR**

**Industrial Dispute No. 13 of 2009**

**Between—**

Sri Bramhanand Aggrwal,  
L-21, Barra 6,  
Kanpur.

**And**

The Regional Manager,  
Central Bank of India,  
372/18-B,  
Civil Lines,  
Gwalior Road, Jhansi.

**AWARD**

1. Central Government Mol New Delhi *vide* notification no. L-12012/70/2008-IR(B-II) dated 04-02-09 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal—

2. Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India, Regional Office Jhansi dismissing Sri Bramhanand Aggrawal, sub accountant of Central Bank of India, Bara Bazar Branch, Jhansi from the bank services *vide* order dated 16-07-87 of disciplinary authority is legal and justified? What relief the workman concerned is entitled to?

3. Brief facts are—

4. After charge of pleadings in this case, the opposite party moved an application along with the copy of the order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 16-05-12 passed in Special Appeal No. 2087 of 2011 between the same parties.

5. It is contended by the opposite party that the reference cannot be proceeded with further in the light of the order of the Hon'ble High Court as of aforesaid.

6. Heard and perused the order of the Hon'ble High Court. It has been found that the claimant has contested his case before the Civil Court on the same point and that matter has ultimately gone up to the Hon'ble High Court. On the basis of that the Hon'ble High Court has found and ordered in Para 29 of its order as follows—

Our conclusions are as follows—

(a) The question regarding legality and justifiability regarding the dismissal order has been decided by the Civil Court. It cannot be reopened by means of reference before the Industrial Tribunal. In the end the special appeal filed by the management has been allowed and held the entire proceedings before the CGIT Kanpur, in the aforesaid reference dated 04-02-09 be dropped.

7. Therefore in the light of the order of the Hon'ble High Court, the present proceedings pending before this tribunal is being dropped as the reference order made to this tribunal has become redundant and that could not be answered either in affirmative or in negative between the parties.

8. Accordingly reference is answered in negative against workman and in favour of the management.

RAM PARKASH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ.3128.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी. के. इन्टरप्राइजेज सतना के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय,

जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 154/2003) प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29011/29/2003-आई.आर. (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th Septemehr, 2012

**S.O. 3128.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 154/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. B.K. Enterprises Ltd. (Satna) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2012.

[No. L-29011/29/2003-IR(M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR**

**No. CGIT/LC/R/154/2003**

**PRESIDING OFFICER: SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN**

Shri Jamir Khan,

United Mines Lime Workers Union,

New Colony,

Sagmania, Satna (MP)

... Workman

**Versus**

M/S. B.K. Enterprises Ltd.,

C-1, flat, Sagmania Lime Stone Mines,

Satna Cement Works,

PO Birla Vikas,

Satna (MP)

... Management

**AWARD**

Passed on this 14th day of August, 2012

1. The Government of India Ministry of Labour *vide* its Notification No. L-29011/29/2003-IR(M) dated 29-8-2003 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

"Whether the action of mgt. of B.K. Enterprises Ltd., Sagmania Lime Stone Mines, Satna Cement works, Distt. Satna (MP) in terminating the services of Shri Munnu Kol, Raghvendra Singh, Ram Prasad, Dhaniram, Jagdish Kol, Chedilal, Surendra Patel and Ramkumar Gautam, Ex. Drivers and Shri Sarkar, Bahadur Singh, Gangaprasad Tiwari, Ex. Supervisors w.e.f. 6-6-2000 is legal and proper? If not to what relief the concerned workers are entitled for?"

2. The Union/workmen did not appear inspite of proper notices. Lastly the then Tribunal proceeded the reference exparte against the Union/workmen on 21-9-07.

3. The management appeared in the case through his counsel on 15-3-2004 but did not file Written Statement in the case. It seems that the parties are not interested in the case or there is no dispute in existence. Thus this is a case of no dispute. Accordingly the reference is answered.

4. In the result, no dispute award is passed without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3129.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेशन डाइरेक्टर, न्यूक्लियर पावर कारपोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया कारवार के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ सी. आर. न. 66/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/88/2006-आई.आर.(डी.यू.)]

सुरेन्द्र कुमार, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3129.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. C.R. No. 66/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Station Director, Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd. Karwar and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-09-2012.

[No. L-42012/88/2006-IR(DU)]

SURENDRA KUMAR, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

#### BANGALORE

DATED 9-08-2012

#### PRESENT

SHRIS.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

**C. R. No. 66/2007**

#### I PARTY

Shri Ganapathi Bhikaro Naik,  
R/o Kadiya Village,  
Karwar Taluk,  
Uttara Kannada District

#### II PARTY

The Station Director,  
Nuclear Power Corporation of  
India Ltd.,  
Kaiga Generating Station,  
Kaiga Village,  
Karwar -581400

#### AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and Sub section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred this dispute *vide* order No. L-42012/88/2006-IR(DU) dated 06-06-2007 for adjudication on the following Schedule :

#### SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Nuclear Power Corporation India Ltd, Kaiga in imposing the penalty of removal from service on Shri Ganapathi B Naik w.e.f. 19-04-2002 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. The brief facts leading to this reference and award may be stated as under :—

Shri Ganapati B Naik (hereinafter referred as first party) who was appointed in the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd., Kaiga, Karwar (hereafter referred as Second Party) as Helper ‘A’ on 17-10-1992 in operations and maintenance section on compassionate ground as son - in-law of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda for the second party in the land acquisition and was regularized on 31-05-1993, on 10-01-2000 served with the charge sheet as under:—

#### Charge Sheet.

“That Shri Ganapati B Naik presenting working as a Helper in O&M section in Kaiga Project had stated in his application dated 12-09-90 submitted in the prescribed format that he is son in law of Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda of Devkar Village whose lands were acquired for Kaiga Project so as to claim employment in Kaiga Project as a member of land affected family.

Shri Ganapati B Naik has also declared that he is married and his wife’s name is Smt. Ganga in the relevant columns of the attestation form dated 29-05-1993. On verification of the details furnished by him in the prescribed format, it is reported that Shri Ganapati B Naik has furnished wrong information about his marriage and that the existence of the girl declared to be his wife could not be ascertained. When asked to explain on the information furnished by him he has submitted the following additional documents in support of his declaration.

1. Certificate issued by Pradhan, Devalmukki Mandal Panchayat certifying his marriage with Smt. Ganga.

2. Affidavit sworn and signed before Notary, UK, Dist.Karwar on 27-07-1991 certifying the marriage of Shri Ganapati B Naik with Smt. Ganga.

On verification based on the above certificate submitted by Shri Ganapati B Naik, it has been reported that Shri Ganapati B Naik son of late Shri Bhikaro Naik has not married Smt. Ganga daughter of Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda as claimed by him. Smt. Ganga the only daughter of Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda is married with one Shri Timmanna alias Appaji son of Shri Seeta Ram Gowda resident of village Shivpur Hemlet Hebbal, Karwar Taluk and as per the traditions her name was changed to Smt. Laxmi after the marriage. Since then Smt. Ganga alias Smt. Laxmi has been living with her husband Shri Timmanna in village Shivapur Hebba and has children from Shri Timmanna.

In this connection an enquiry was conducted by District administration at our instances and the District Administration in the report No. RB/LAQ/MISC/SR/53/99-2000 dated 17-11-1999 along with a statement given by Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda has stated that the claim made by Shri Ganapati B Naik is false.

Shri Ganapati B Naik has suppressed factual information on his marital status and has produced false certificates. By these acts Shri Ganapati B. Naik has committed a grave misconduct and has acted in a manner of unbecoming of an Corporation Employee under Model Standing Orders.”

3. On his reply to the charge sheet that he did marry Ganga, daughter of Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda, land looser on 2-05-1990 and as she had deserted him, after causing notice in the month of October 1995 he filed a divorce petition on the file of Civil Judge (Sr.Division), Karwar in matrimonial case No. 11/1998 wherein his wife Ganga did apply for maintenance and the same is pending and due to such strained relationship his father-in-law might have made some allegations and that his daughter Smt. Ganga is legally wedded wife and at his instance only he was given job on compassionate ground. Management being not satisfied with the said reply ordered for domestic enquiry appointing Shri R. S. Prakash as Inquiring Authority and Shri R. Vasudevan, Asstt. Manager (P&IR) as Presenting Officer. The said enquiry officer after observing the formalities of preliminary hearing on presenting officer producing the application given by the first party for his appointment dated 12-09-1990; marriage invitation card produced along with the application; certificate issued by Spl. Land Acquisition Officer dated 21-08-1990 the land looser Shri B.V. Gowda having requested to provide the job to his son-in-law Shri Ganapati Bhikaro Naik of Kadia; the attestation form given by the first party while taking the employment; affidavit sworn to by the first party before the notary dated 27-07-1991 he being the son-in-law of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda; certificate issued by Pradhan, Devalmakki, Mandal Panchayat, Karwar dated 28-12-1991 the first party marrying Ganga the daughter of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda; letter addressed to Sr. Manager(P&IR), N.P.C, Kaiga from office of Dy.Commissioner, U. K. Karwar dated 17-11-1999. accompanying the report given by the Assistant commissioner of Karwar and the statement of Shri B.V.

Gowda purported to have been taken by the Assistant Commissioner of Devalmakki on 29-09-1999, marking them as P1 to P7 while recording the statement of first party and the evidence of Shri Dinesh Gaokar, JRA.II Admn., who was associated with the investigation of confirming first party being the son in law of the land looser; Shri Pradeep Shetty, Sr.Clerk in the second party who was also associated with investigation in confirming the relationship of first party with the daughter of land looser; Shri Suresh Shet, Pradhan, Mandal Panchayat had issued certificate regarding marriage of first party with the daughter of land looser B.V. Gowda; Shri Narayan Karnat, neighbour of the first party and Shri N.S. Bhat, allegedly acted as marriage Priest as DW1 to DW5 and exhibiting statement given by Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda dated 24-05-1997 and xerox copy of the application submitted by Smt. Ganga Naik in the court of the Civil Judge, Karwar as Ex. D1 & D2, after receiving written brief from the Presenting Officer and the Defence Representative by his report dated 1-02-2001 held the charge being proved. The Disciplinary Authority after giving opportunity of hearing to the first party passed the impugned order dated 19-04-2002 and on appeal by the first party the Appellate Authority after affording opportunity of hearing confirmed the order of the Disciplinary Authority. Thereafter the first party raised the dispute before the Asstt.Labour Commissioner (Central) Mangalore and on its failure it resulted in the present reference. After receipt of the reference pursuant to the notices issued by this tribunal the first party and the second party entered their appearance through their respective advocates and filed their claim statement and counter statement respectively. After completion of the pleadings having regard to certain allegations made in the claim statement while raising a preliminary issue as to “Whether the Domestic Enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is fair and proper” while receiving the evidence of the Presenting Officer for the second party as MW1 and exhibiting copy of the order of the Disciplinary Authority dated 1-03-2000 appointing Shri R.S. Prakash as Enquiry Officer; copy of the order of disciplinary authority appointing Shri R. Vasudevan as Presenting Officer; copy of the notice of enquiry issued to the first party dated 11-04-2000; letter given by the Defence Representative dated 25-04-2000; proceedings of the enquiry; written arguments filed by the first party and management representative before the enquiry officer; copy of the finding of the enquiry officer dated 1-02-2001; seven documents marked before the enquiry officer for the management; copy of the covering letter of enquiry report sent to the charge sheeted employee/ first party dated 3-02-2001; reply given by the first party dated 27-02-2001; copy of the order of Disciplinary Authority dated 19-04-2002; appeal memo of the first party dated 31-05-2002; copy of the order of appellate authority dated 4-10-2002; copy of the review petition dated 1-01-2003 and the copy of the order of review petition as Ex. M1 to M 18 and *interalia* the evidence of first party as WW1 and



exhibiting notarized copies, of the statement of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda dated 24-05-1997; his wedding card dated 7-05-1990; certificate issued by the Mandal Pradhan Devalamakki, Karwar dated 28-12-1991, Sworn affidavit of himself dated 27-07-1991; copy of nomination form dated 5-07-1997; certificate issued by Special Land Acquisition Officer, Dandeli dated 21-08-1990; letter of Assistant Commissioner dated 14-10-1999; statement said to have been given by Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda dated 29-09-1999; representation submitted by him to the Disciplinary Authority dated 27-02-2001; entire matrimonial proceedings in MC No.11/1998; copy of the petition in MC 11/1998; certified copy of the order passed in MC No.11/1998 as Ex. W1 to W11 respectively and after hearing the arguments addressed by the learned advocates appearing for both sides by order dated 12-10-2010 the preliminary issue is answered in the affirmative holding that the domestic enquiry is fair and proper, arguments addressed by the learned advocates appearing for both sides on merits, have been heard.

4. There being no dispute that the first party was appointed as Helper 'A' in the second party on compassionate ground as the son-in-law of the land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda and his service was regularized on 31-05-1993 and he has been charged that on verification of the details furnished by him it is found that he had furnished wrong information about his marriage with Smt. Ganga, daughter of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda and that Smt. Ganga the only daughter of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda being found to have been married with Shri Timmanna *alias* Appaji, son of Shri Seeta Ram Gowda resident of Village Shiyapur Hemlet, Hebbal, Karwar Taluk charge was served on him and on enquiry he has been dismissed from service, now the points that arises for my consideration are—

- (i) Whether the management established before the enquiry officer the information given by the first party that he had married Smt. Ganga, daughter of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna was found false?
- (ii) Whether the punishment imposed is disproportionate to the misconduct proved against him?
- (iii) What Award?

5. On appreciation of article of charge, the pleadings of both the sides, the evidence brought on, record by the management and the charge sheeted employee in the Domestic Enquiry, in the light of the arguments addressed by the learned advocates appearing for both sides as well as the citations referred to by them my finding on point No.(i) is in the Negative, Point No.(ii) as does not survive for consideration and No.(iii) as per final award for the following reasons :

#### Reasons.

6. It is borne out from the proceedings of the enquiry and the report of the enquiry officer that the management while producing application given by the first party for his appointment dated 12-09-1990; the marriage invitation card annexed to his application; the certificate issued by the Special Land Acquisition Officer dated 21-08-1990 to the effect that he is the son-in-law of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda; the attestation form given by the first party while taking the employment; the affidavit sworn by the first party before the notary dated 27-07-1991; the certificate issued by the Mandal Pradhan Devalamakki, Karwar dated 28-12-1991 on the basis of which the first party was given an appointment and the letter No. RB/LAQ/MISC/SR/53/99-2000 dated 17-11-1999 received from the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Karwar along with the report submitted to the Dy.Commissioner by the Assistant Commissioner dated 14-10-1999 and the statement of Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda purported to have been recorded by the Assistant Commissioner dated 29-09-1999 through presenting officer and getting them exhibited as Ex. P1 to P7 respectively, did not lead any oral evidence. Then the Enquiry Officer after recording the statement of the CSE/first party wherein he has claimed that he had married Smt. Ganga, daughter of land looser Shri Bellanna Venkanna Gowda, their relations being strained he filed a matrimonial case on the file of Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Karwar and examined 5 witnesses as DW1 to 5, on the basis of whose recommendations his claim that he was the son-in-law of land looser was accepted by the management, the enquiry officer only relying upon Ex. P7 held the charge being proved. The management before the enquiry officer neither examined the Dy. Commissioner nor the Assistant Commissioner to whom the Dy. Commissioner allegedly entrusted the job of enquiring into the relationship of first party with the daughter of land looser Shri B.V. Gowda, nor the land looser and thereby deprived the charge sheeted employee/first party from challenging the report of the Assistant Commissioner on the basis of which the charge is held to be proved. On the other hand the evidence of DW1 to DW5 do suggest that the first party had married Ganga the daughter of land looser Shri B.V. Gowda and their relationship being strained the first party had initiated divorce proceedings before the Civil Court and there Smt. Ganga did apply for maintenance claiming to be his wife. This evidence pertaining to the matrimonial case itself is sufficient to accept the case of the first party that he had married Ganga the daughter of land looser Shri B.V. Gowda and at the instance of the said land looser he was given an appointment on compassionate ground. Even assuming that the land looser Shri B.V. Gowda gave a statement before the Assistant Commissioner which is annexed to his alleged report under Ex.P7 with all certainty it can be said that due to the strained relation ship of the first party with his daughter he might have given such a statement. Either in



the letter written for Dy. Commissioner or in the accompanying report of the Assistant Commissioner addressed to the Dy. Commissioner it is indicated that a regular enquiry was conducted in the presence of the first party. Therefore, on the basis of such alleged exparte report given by the Assistant Commissioner to the Dy. Commissioner and the statement allegedly given by the land looser Shri B.V.Gowda before the Assistant Commissioner the enquiry officer ought not to have held charge being proved. Under the circumstances I have arrived at the conclusion that the finding of the enquiry officer the charge being proved is baseless and perverse.

7. In view of my finding that the finding of the enquiry officer charge being proved is baseless and perverse the second point does not survive for consideration.

8. Since the second party without any proper evidence passed the impugned order of dismissal and the first party suffered such an order without any fault on his part, he is entitle for reinstatement with full back wages, continuity of service and all other consequential benefits that he could have received in the absence of the impugned order of removal from service. In the result I pass the following Award:

#### AWARD

The reference is allowed holding that the action of the management of Nuclear Power Corporation Ltd, Kaiga in imposing the penalty of removal from service on Shri Ganapthi B. Naik w.e.f 19.04.2002 is illegal and not justified and that he is entitle for reinstatement with full back wages, continuity of service and all other consequential benefits that he could have received in the absence of the impugned order of removal from service.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 9-08-2012)

S.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3130.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सिंडिकेट बैंक के प्रबंध तंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/57/2001 को प्रकाशित करती है। जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/77/2001-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3130.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/57/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Nagpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial

Dispute between the employers in relation to the management Syndicate Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/77/2001-IR (B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI J.P. CHAND. PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR**

**Case No. CGIT/NGP/57/2001**

Date: 05-09-2012.

**Party No.1:** The Managing Director,  
Syndicate Bank,  
SB.I.R. Division Head Office,  
Manipal (Karnataka)-576 119.

#### Versus

**Party No. 2 :** Shri Pravin Ganapathrao Khode,  
R/o. Shivaji Ward, Ramtek,  
Tal: Ramtek,  
Nagpur.

#### AWARD

(Dated : 5th September, 2012)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of Industrial 'Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government has referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of and their workman, Shri for adjudication, as per letter No. L- 12012/77/2001-IR (B-II) dated 13-08-2001, with the following schedule :—

"Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank through its Chief Manager, Syndicate Bank, Indl. Relations Division, Head Office, Manipal in terminating the services of Shri Pravin Ganapathrao Khode, w.e.f. 30-05-2000 is legal, proper and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, the parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim and written statement and accordingly, the workman, Shri Pravin Khode, ('the workman" in short), filed the statement of claim and the management of Syndicate Bank, ("Party No.1" in short) filed its written statement.

The case of the workman as presented in the statement of claim is that he joined the services of party no. 1 on 17-07-1981 as a probationary clerk and he was confirmed in service of the Bank w.e.f. 25.01.1982 and he was working as a clerk at Mansar branch of the Bank from 03-02-1983 to 21-05-1998 and he was transferred from Mansar Branch to Wadi branch, Nagpur and worked there from 23-05-1998 to

30.05.2000, the date of his illegal dismissal from services and during his entire service period, neither any warning letter nor any charge sheet was issued against him and on 19.05.1999, a charge sheet was issued against him, on false and fabricated grounds. The further case of the workman is that on 17.03.1997, Smt. Rekha Daulat Sontakke, a customer /borrower of Mansar Branch alongwith one Shri Shamrao Sahare visited the Bank and wanted to know about the loan amount due against loan account No.. OSL A/c. 46/89 and approached him for the same and since OSL A/c. 46/89 was closed from proceeds of DICGC claim amount in 1992 itself and calculation of loan amount was not readily available on record, he asked Smt. Rekha Sontakke to deposit a tentative amount of Rs. 8000/- in cash section and to give the same to Shri Meshram, who was on duty as cashier on that date and after half an hour or so, the Branch Manager, Shri M.P. Gokhale called him and asked to prepare a "No dues certificate" in favour of Smt. Rekha Sontakke, saying that she had already deposited her loan dues with the cashier and as per the instructions of the Branch Manager, he prepared a "No dues Certificate" in plain paper, as printed form was not available and put the same on the table of the Branch Manager alongwith the loan register for verification and he went to his section and the "No dues Certificate" was issued by the Branch Manager after his seal and signature and the issuance of "No dues Certificate" dated 17.03.1997 came to light in December, 1998, when Shri Meshram, clerk of Mansar Branch visited the village of Smt. Rekha Sontakke in connection of loan recovery and on that day, Smt. Rekha came to know that the "No dues Certificate" was a false one and her loan amount was still outstanding and the said certificate was issued only by deceiving the Branch Manager, Shri Gokhale, by giving false statement of repayment of loan amount on 17.03.1997 and as Smt Sontakke did not go to the Bank to file any complaint regarding misappropriation of the amount deposited by her, it was clear that she did not deposit any amount on 17.03.1997 and had any amount been deposited by her in the bank on 17.03.1997, then she should have gone to the Bank to lodge a complaint and on 10.01.1999, Shri Gokhale, approached Smt. Sontakke at her residence and forced and threatened her to give a complaint and in her complaint, Smt. Sontakke mentioned that she had paid the entire loan amount to the cashier at the cash counter on 17.03.1997 and the cashier did not give her the counter foil of the deposit slip and when she asked the cashier for the counter foil, the cashier gave her the "No dues Certificate" signed and sealed by the Branch Manager and in her complaint dated 10.01.1999, Smt. Sontakke did not mention his name or that she had paid the amount of Rs. 8000 to him (the workman) and Shri Gokhale, the Ex-Branch Manager in his letter dated 13.01.1999 had written that, from the party's letter, it is clear that the cashier, who had performed duty on 17.03.1997 had played mischief and obtained his (Mr. Gokhale's) signature on the "No dues Certificate" and the Ex-Branch Manager also did not mention his name in the letter and the management of

the Bank did not take any action on the complaint of Smt. Sontakke dated 10.01.1999 and on 25.03.1999, Shri Garge, the then Branch Manager of Mansar Branch, Shri G.M. Narayan, the Deputy Chief Manager and Shri S. Pasupati, Deputy Chief Officer (ID) went to the village of Smt. Sontakke and forced, threatened and instigated her to write a complaint as per their direction or otherwise to cancel the "No dues certificate" and that she would be sent to jail for committing fraud with the bank and under such threat, Smt. Sontakke gave another complaint dated 25.03.1999 mentioning therein that she gave Rs. 8000 to him (the workman), as per the dictation of the Branch Officer to falsely implicate him and to save the neck of Shri Gokhale and Shri R.B. Meshram, who was on duty as cashier on 17.03.1997 and who had issue the "no dues certificate" to Smt. Sontakke and Smt. Sontakke realized the gravity of her false complaint dated 10.01.1999 and 25.03.1999 and arranged the loan amount and repaid the entire loan amount of Rs. 11,503/- on 31.03.1999 to the Bank and she also submitted a letter dated 31.03.1999 to the Bank Manager, Mansar Branch stating that as she did not pay anything to anybody on 17.03.1997 and for that she paid the entire loan amount on 31.03.1999 and on 31.05.1999, Smt. Sontakke wrote another letter to the Manager, Syndicate Bank, Mansar Branch stating that she had obtained the "No dues Certificate" on 17.03.1997 from the Branch Manager, Shri Gokhale, without depositing any amount in the Bank and on 31.03.1999, she paid Rs. 11,503/- as full and final payment and that she be excused for submitting false complaints on 10.01.1999 and 25.03.1999.

It is further pleaded by the workman that inspite of the fact that Smt. Sontakke deposited the entire loan amount on 31.03.1999 and in spite of her giving in writing that she had not paid any amount on 17.03.1997 to anybody, a charge sheet dated 19.05.1999 was issued against him and he submitted his reply to the said charge sheet, but party no. 1 did not find his explanation to be satisfactory and constituted a departmental enquiry committee and appointed Shri M. J. Sadhakaran as the enquiry officer and Shri D.B. Setty as the presenting officer and on 03.09.1999, Smt. Sontakke wrote a letter to the Deputy General Manager, Syndicate Bank, Mumbai informing him about her inability to attend the enquiry proceeding due to her advance, stage of pregnancy and her complaint dated 10.01.1999 and 25.03.1999 were written under pressure of the Bank Officers and as desired by them and the same were false complaints and a similar letter was also given by her to the Manager of Mansar Branch alongwith the copy of the letter dated 31.05.1999, to be produced before the enquiry officer as her statement and the enquiry officer did not consider this letter during the enquiry proceedings and on 03.09.1999, 04.09.1999 and 06.09.1999, Smt. Sontakke could not able to attend the enquiry proceedings due to advance stage of her pregnancy and she submitted a written statement vide her letter dated 03.09.1999 stating that her complaints dated 10.01.1999 and 25.03.1999 were false and her letters dated

31-3-1999, 31-05-1999 and 03-09-1999 were true and the same be taken as her statement in the enquiry proceedings and further during enquiry, on 10-03-2000 at Bombay Smt. Sontakke submitted before the enquiry officer that she had not paid any loan amount on 17-03-1997 and she had paid her loan amount of Rs. 11,503 on 31-03-1999 towards the full and final settlement and without any evidence against him, his services were terminated w.e.f. 30-05-2000 illegally and he was victimized.

The workman has prayed to set aside the order of dismissal dated 30-05-2000 and to reinstate him in service with continuity and full backwages and other consequential benefits.

3. The case of the party no.1 is that the workman was working as a clerk at its Mansar Branch from 03-02-1983 to 21-05-1998 and on 17-03-1997, one Smt. Rekha Daulat Sontakke, a customer/ borrower of Mansar Branch of the Bank having OSL A/c. 46/89 came to the Branch alongwith Shri M.B. Kule and Shri Shamrao Sahare to repay her loan amount and the workman, who was working in the advance section and sitting at, the counter near the cash cabin called Smt. Sontakke and her companions and enquired the purpose of their visit and when Smt. Sontakke informed him of her coming to the Bank to close her loan account, the workman asked her to wait for some time and after some time, he called her again and informed her that a total sum of Rs. 8000 is required to be paid by her and Mrs. Sontakke paid the amount of Rs. 8000 to the workman across the counter, expecting the cash receipt counter foil from him for depositing the amount and after waiting from some time, when she asked the workman for the money receipt, the workman handed over a "no dues certificate" to her which was written by him in his own handwriting on a plain paper and duly signed by Mr. M.P. Gokhale, the Manager of the Branch and when she asked the workman about the money receipt, the workman told her that the "no dues certificate" would be sufficient proof of payment and money receipt would not be necessary and Mr. Meshram, clerk, who was entrusted with temporary cashier's duties on 17-03-1997 was not aware of the cash deposited with the workman by Mrs. Sontakke and the matter of Mrs. Sontakke depositing a sum of Rs. 8000 with the workman on 17-03-1997 came to light, when Shri Meshram alongwith another staff member visited Patgaury, the village of Mrs. Sontakke for recovery of dues from the borrowers and visited the house of Mrs. Sontakke for recovery of the outstanding dues against her loan account and Mrs. Sontakke informed that she had repaid the entire loan amount in cash on 17-03-1997 and showed the "no dues certificate" issued by the workman and as there was no such entry in the records of the Bank, after his return to the Bank, Shri Meshram reported the matter immediately to the branch Manager and a thorough verification of the Branch's books of records were made, but the records did not reveal any credit of Rs. 8000 in the loan account of Mrs. Sontakke

on 17-03-1997, which established that the workman accepted cash of Rs. 8000 from the borrower meant to be appropriated towards her loan account, OSL A/c. 46/89 and as the said loan account was written-off by means of credit received from DICGC, instead of depositing the money received by him from Mrs. Sontakke, with the cashier, the workman gave a "no dues certificate" written by himself on a plain paper to her and misappropriated the amount of Rs. 8000 deposited by the customer, which was prejudicial to the interest of the Bank and the said acts constituted acts of gross misconduct as per the relevant provisions of the Bipartite settlement and therefore, charge sheet-cum-suspension order No. MZO/IRC/CGT(W) 16/99 dated 19-05-1999 was served against him and pending enquiry, he was placed under suspension and the workman was given the opportunity to submit his explanation to the charges levelled against him and as his explanation dated 11-06-1999 was found not to be satisfactory, the Disciplinary Authority decided to conduct an enquiry into the charges and accordingly, appointed the enquiry officer and the departmental enquiry was conducted by the enquiry officer by giving all opportunities to the workman to defend himself and the enquiry officer after analyzing the evidence placed before him during the enquiry, held the charge of the gross misconduct levelled against the workman as proved and the Disciplinary Authority taking into consideration all the aspects of the case including the evidence placed in the enquiry and the report dated 18-10-1999 submitted by the enquiry officer and the gravity of the misconduct, proposed the punishment of "dismissal" from the services of the Bank and the workman was asked to show cause as to why the proposed punishment should not be imposed on him and the workman appeared before the Disciplinary authority on 11-01-2000 and taking into consideration of the request of the workman to allow him to produce his witnesses in his defence, the disciplinary authority directed for a denovo enquiry for the specific purpose of recording the evidence of the defence witness/witnesses and their cross-examination and the enquiry officer was also directed to submit a fresh report on the evidence already recorded and on the fresh evidence of the defence and the enquiry officer after giving due opportunity to the workman to adduce defence evidence, on 10-04-2000 submitted a fresh report, holding the charges as proved and taking into consideration the report dated 10-04-2000, all aspect of the case, evidence placed before the enquiry officer and the gravity of misconduct, the disciplinary authority called upon the workman, by proposing the punishment of dismissal from services of the Bank, to appear before him in person and to show cause as to why the proposed punishment should not be imposed on him and on 26-05-2000, the workman appeared before the disciplinary authority and made his submissions and as he failed to bring out any extenuating factors, looking into all aspects of the case, the Disciplinary authority imposed the punishment of dismissal from the services of the Bank with

immediate effect vide order dated 30-05-2000 and the workman filed an appeal against the order of punishment, before the Appellate Authority and the Appellate Authority after hearing the representative of the workman and analyzing all the aspects of the case, confirmed the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority and dismissed the appeal.

It is also pleaded by the party No. 1 that the charge sheet dated 19-05-1999 was not based on false and fabricated grounds and the same was issued on the basis of the findings of an investigation and the workman was dismissed from services of the Bank after due process of departmental action as stipulated in the Bipartite settlement and the Bank lost confidence in the workman and the workman is not entitled to any relief.

4. In the rejoinder, the workman after denying the facts mentioned in the written statement has reiterated the facts mentioned in the statement of claim.

5. As this is a case of termination of the workman from services, as a punishment in the domestic enquiry held against him, the validity and fairness of the enquiry was taken up for consideration as a preliminary issue and by order dated 03-10-2006, the enquiry conducted against the workman was held to be proper and legal and so also in accordance with the principles of natural justice.

6. At the time of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the workman that it is clear from the evidence on record that though on 17-03-1997, no amount was paid by Smt. Sontakke towards her loan amount, she managed to obtain a "no dues certificate" Ext. W-V from the Branch Manager and the fact of issuance of such a certificate came to light, when in December, 1998, a recovery team went to the village of Smt. Sontakke and asked her to repay her loan amount and when she produced the "no dues certificate" after claiming to have paid the whole loan amount on 17-03-1997 and the recovery team reported the matter to the Branch Manager and Shri Gokhale, the then Branch Manager went to the village of Smt. Sontakke on 10-01-1999 and obtained a complaint from her regarding payment of Rs. 8000 to the cashier and obtaining of the "no dues certificate" and the complaint was written as per the dictation of Shri Gokhale and on the basis of such complaint, Shri Gokhale on 13-01-1999 submitted a report to the Regional Manager stating that the cashier on duty on 17-03-1997 deceived him (Shri Gokhale) and got the "no dues certificate" signed from him, without depositing the loan amount and on 25-03-1999, a team of Bank Officers went to the residence of Smt. Sontakke in her village and forced her to write a complaint as per their dictation and Smt. Sontakke was forced to mention the name of the workman in that complaint, to be the person who had received the amount of Rs. 8000 paid by her on 17-03-1997 and to have issued the "no dues certificate", but subsequently on 31-03-1999, Smt. Sontakke informed the

manager of Mansar Branch in writing that on 17-03-1997, she did not deposit any amount, but obtained the "no dues certificate" by falsely representing to have paid the loan amount and actually on 31-03-1999, she repaid the entire loan amount and on 31-05-1999, she also wrote another letter to the Branch Manager intimating the same thing and also stating that the Bank officers, who had visited her house forced her to make the false complaint implicating the workman and in her letter dated 03-09-1999, Smt. Sontakke also informed such facts to the General Manager, Syndicate Bank, Zonal Office, Mumbai and to treat her letter dated 31-05-1999 to be her statement before the enquiry officer and on 10-03-2000, Mrs. Sontakke appeared as a defence witness before the enquiry officer and stated that she had not paid any loan amount on 17-03-1999 and she repaid the entire loan amount of Rs. 11,503 on 31-03-1999 and earlier, she had not been able to attend the enquiry due to her advance stage of pregnancy and as her child was very small and Shri Shyamrao Sahare, who was examined as a witness for the management also did not support the case of the management and the letter given by her on 25-03-1999 was written by him as per the instruction of the Bank officers and the contents of the said letter not to be true and Mrs. Sontakke also swore an affidavit stating about withdrawing her complaint dated 25-03-1999 against the workman and the contents of her complaint dated 25-03-1999 not to be true and she was forced to write the false complaint against the workman by the Bank Officers and from the materials on record and the facts as mentioned above, it is clear that there was no complaint or evidence against the workman and the findings of the enquiry officer are perverse and the punishment of termination of the workman from services is shockingly disproportionate and as such, the workman is entitled to be reinstated in service with continuity and full back wages with other consequential benefits.

7. Per contra, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the Party No. 1 that by order dated 03-10-2006, it has already been held by this Tribunal that the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman to be legal, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and as the workman committed serious misconduct of doing an act prejudicial to the interest of the Bank or likely to involve the Bank in serious loss, in terms of clause 19.5(j) of Bipartite Settlement, by accepting cash of Rs. 8000 from Mrs. Sontakke meant to be appropriated towards her OSL A/c. 46/89 and issuing a "no dues certificate" and misappropriating the said amount without depositing the same in the account of Mrs. Sontakke and in the disciplinary proceedings, he was found guilty of the charges by the enquiry officer and the findings of the enquiry officer are based on the evidence adduced in the disciplinary proceedings and the enquiry officer has given his findings by analyzing the evidence in a rational manner and assigning cogent reasons for arriving at the findings and the findings of the enquiry officer are not at all perverse. It



was submitted further by the learned advocate for the Party No.1 that unless and until the punishment is found wholly disproportionate to the misconduct proved, there is no scope for the Tribunal normally to interfere with the punishment and serious misconduct of misappropriation of money has been proved against the workman, who was working as a cashier in the bank and the bank has lost confidence in the workman and as such, the termination of the workman from service is just and proper and in a case of misappropriation, there is need to consider the past record of the employee while imposing the sentence.

8. At this juncture, I think it necessary to mention that it is consistently held and accepted by the Hon'ble Apex Court that strict rules of evidence are not applicable to the proceedings, before the Labour Court/Tribunal. It is also well settled that the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to interfere with the disciplinary matters or punishment cannot be equated with an appellate jurisdiction and the Tribunal cannot interfere with the findings of the enquiry officer or competent authority where they are not arbitrary or utterly perverse. The power to impose penalty on a delinquent officer is conferred on the competent authority either by an act of legislature or rules made under the provision of Art. 309 of the Constitution. If there has been an enquiry consistent, with the rules and in accordance with principles of natural justice what punishment would meet the ends of justice is a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the competent authority. If the penalty can lawfully be imposed and is imposed on the proved misconduct, the Tribunal has no power to substitute its own discretion for that of the authority. The adequacy of penalty unless it is malafide is certainly not a matter for the Tribunal to concern itself with. The Tribunal also cannot interfere with the penalty if the conclusion of the enquiry officer or the competent authority is based on evidence. It is also well settled that a disciplinary proceeding is not a criminal trial and the standard or proof required is that of preponderance of probability and not proof beyond reasonable doubt.

9. So, keeping in view the settled principles regarding the power of the Tribunal to interfere with the findings and punishment imposed by the authorities in a departmental enquiry, now, the present case in hand is to be considered.

10. In this case, after going through the materials on record including the documents relating to the domestic enquiry held against the workman, it is found that management has examined six witnesses and produced 15 documents to prove the charge levelled against the workman. The workman produced Mrs. Sontakke as a defence witness. Mrs. Sontakke gave her evidence on 10-03-2000 in the enquiry and was cross-examined in part by the management representative. On the request of Mrs. Sontakke, the enquiry was adjourned to 11-03-2000 for her further cross-examination. On 11-03-2000, Mrs. Sontakke did not appear for her cross-examination. The workman

filed an application for adjournment of the enquiry on the ground that due to illness of her child, Mrs. Sontakke was not able to attend the enquiry, so the enquiry was adjourned to 21-03-2000 for further cross-examination of Mrs. Sontakke. On 21-03-2000, neither Mrs. Sontakke nor the workman attended the enquiry. So, the enquiry officer was compelled to close the enquiry. As Mrs. Sontakke neither appeared herself nor produce by the workman, for complete cross-examination, her evidence cannot be taken into consideration.

11. So for the submission made on behalf of the workman that Mrs. Sontakke was forced by the Bank officers to give false complaints against him and about the issuance of the "No dues Certificates" are concerned, from the materials on record, it is found that the same are afterthought by the workman, only to save his own skin. In this regard, I think it necessary to refer to the showcause filed by the workman to the charge sheet submitted against him. In his show cause, the workman has nowhere mentioned that the Bank officer forced Mrs. Sontakke to write false complaints against him. In his show cause, the workman has mentioned categorically about Mrs. Sontakke coming to the branch alongwith Shri Shamrao Sahare and contacting him to know the position of her loan account and about his asking her to deposit Rs. 8000 in the account. It is pertinent to mention here that the workman in his show cause has mentioned that, "As Mrs. Rekha Sontakke was accompanied with a reputed person, Shri Shamrao Sahare, the Sarpanch/Village head of Mrs. Rekha Sontakke's village Patgowari, I had no reason to take doubt that the said amount of Rs. 8000 is actually paid deposited with the cahier and went (wrongly mentioned as "want" in the show cause) on writing no dues certificate and handed over the same to Mrs. Rekha Sontakke for "obtaining signature of the Manager in good faith only." However, giving a total go bye to such a stand, in his statement of claim, the workman has mentioned that on 17-03-1997, Smt. Sontakke visited the Bank and enquired from him about her loan account OSLA/c 46/89 and as the said loan account was closed from proceeds of DICGC claim amount in 1992 itself and calculation of loan amount was not readily available on record, he asked Mrs. Sontakke to deposit a tentative amount of Rs. 8000 in cash section and after half an hour or so, the Branch Manager, Shri M.P. Gokhale called him to prepare a "no dues certificate" of Smt. Sontakke, as she had deposited her loan dues with cashier and as per the instruction of the Branch Manager, he prepared the "no dues certificate" on plain paper, as printed form was not available and put the same on the table of Branch Manager alongwith loan register for verification and he went to his section. The stands taken by the workman in his show cause and in the statement of claim are very contradictory to each other and therefore cannot be believed.

Further more, in his show cause, the workman has mentioned that, "I was very much surprised to know, that

Mrs. Rekha Daulat Sontakke told with Shri R. S. Meshram Clerk of our Mansar Branch during his routine recovery visit to the village, that the amount of Rs. 8000 was paid to me on 17-03-1997 at the Branch Counter on the day of her visit to the Branch alongwith two others.” The said statement shows that Mrs. Sontakke had made complaint against the workman about payment of the amount of Rs. 8000 to him, without any pressure from anybody. Moreover, during the cross-examination of the management’s witnesses, MW1 Mr. Roshan Balkrishna Meshram, Clerk, MW-2, Shri Chandra Sekhar Narayan Rao Garge, the Branch Manager, MW-4 Shri Mohan Prakash Gokhale, the Ex-Branch Manager and MW-6 Shri G. M. Naik, the Chief Manager, Regional Office, Nagpur, even no suggestion was given to them about their forcing Mrs. Sontakke to give false complaints against the workman. Hence, I find no force in the contentions raised by the learned advocate for the workman.

It is found from the materials on record that the enquiry officer has dealt with the allegations made against the workman systematically and he has assigned cogent reasons in support of his findings after analyzing the evidence. The findings of the enquiry officer are based on the evidence adduced in the enquiry. From the materials on record, it also cannot be said that this is a case of no evidence and the findings given by the enquiry officer cannot be arrived at by a prudent man on the evidence available on record. Hence, the findings of the enquiry officer cannot be said to be perverse.

12. In the instant case, the workman was found guilty of misappropriating the customers fund, so, there was nothing wrong in the Bank losing confidence or faith in such an employee and awarding punishment of dismissal. In such cases, there is no place for generosity or misplaced sympathy and to interfere with the quantum of punishment.

From the materials on record and the discussions made above, it is found that there is no ground to interfere with the punishment imposed against the workman. Hence, it is ordered:—

### ORDER

The action of the management of Syndicate Bank through its Chief Manager, Syndicate Bank, Indl. Relations Division, Head Office, Manipal in terminating the services of Shri Pravin Ganapathrao Khode, w.e.f. 30-05-2000 is legal, proper and justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

J. P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3131.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, बैंक ऑफ महाराष्ट्र के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम

न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 71/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं.एल.-12011/49/2006-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3131.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.No. 71/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jaipur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Maharashtra and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-09-2012.

[No. L-12011/49/2006-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

### ANNEXURE

### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM-LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

### PRESENT

N.K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

**I.D. No.71/2006**

Reference No. L-12011/49/2006-IR(B-II) dated : 13-09-2006

The General Secretary  
Rajasthan Pradesh Bank Workers',  
Organisation, C-13, Ojhaji Ka Bagh,  
Gandhi Nagar Mod, Jaipur

V/s

The Dy. General Manager  
Bank of Maharashtra  
Regional Office, 6/30-31,  
West Extension Field,  
Ajmal Khan Marg, Karol Bagh,  
New Delhi.

### PRESENT

For the Applicant Union : Sh. R.C. Jain

For the Non-applicant : Sh. Rajesh Jain

### AWARD

**3.8.2012**

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following Industrial dispute to this tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of Maharashtra through Dy. General Manager, New Delhi in awarding punishment vide order No. AX-1/ST/DM/568/2002/246 dated 28-1-2002 to Shri Purnesh Kumar Sharma is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. These facts are not in dispute that while workman was working as clerk in the branch of the non-applicant bank at Sriganganagar, he was served upon a charge sheet dated 1-6-93. The enquiry officer was appointed who submitted his report on 26-10-99. Copy of enquiry report was sent to the workman for submitting his report and after affording opportunity for personal hearing the disciplinary authority imposed punishment vide order dated 8-6-01. In appeal preferred against the said order, the appellate authority vide order dated 5-7-01 reviewed the punishment awarded by the disciplinary authority and imposed penalties of reduction by two stages in time scale and censure.

3. The union in its claim statement has assailed the impugned orders of the disciplinary authority dated 8-6-01 as well as order of the appellate authority dated 21-12-01 on the ground of violation of principle of natural justice.

4. The management has failed to produce the entire enquiry record of the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman. Therefore, as regards fairness of the enquiry following order was passed on 19-4-2012.

“In absence of entire enquiry record it is deemed that enquiry conducted against the workman was not fair and proper and enquiry stands vitiated.”

5. Heard both the parties on the merits of the case.

6. Since, the management has failed to produce complete enquiry record of the domestic enquiry, it has been deemed that enquiry was not fair and proper and it stands vitiated. Consequently, the punishment orders passed by the disciplinary authority and appellate authority on 8-6-01 and 21-12-01 respectively and administrative order issued on 28-2-02 are not legal and justified and the same are liable to be set aside.

7. For the foregoing reasons, the action of the management of the bank in awarding punishment to the workman vide order dated 28-1-02 is not legal and justified. The impugned punishment order is set aside. Resultantly, the workman is entitled to get all consequential benefits. The reference is answered accordingly.

8. Award as above.

N. K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ. 3132.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एलसी/आर/6/97) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/331/95-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3132.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/6/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of UCO Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/331/95-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/6/97

Presiding Officer: SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN  
General Secretary,  
Indian National Bank Employees Federation,  
9, Sanwer Road,  
Ujjain (MP) . . . Workman

#### Versus

Divisional Manager,  
UCO Bank,  
11, Purana Palasiya,  
Indore (MP) . . . Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 29th day of August, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/331/95-IR(B-2) dated 30-12-96 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank, Divisional Office, Indore in terminating the services of Shri H.S. Muvel, Clerk, Ghonsala Branch, Distt. Ujjain w.e.f. 10-8-94 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The case of the Union/workman, in short is that the workman Shri Hari Singh Muvel is member of Indian National Bank Karmchari Federation, Ujjain. It is stated that a criminal case was lodged against the workman at Kharakha Ujjain police station and he was suspended w.e.f. 21-9-1992 by the management. He was served with a chargesheet dated 24-4-1993 on 29-4-93 in English. The workman gave reply to serve chargesheet in Hindi version. He had also represented in view of settlement that the departmental proceeding be stayed till the disposal of criminal case as on the same issues a criminal case is pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate, Ujjain but the



management gave no reply and the departmental proceeding was proceeded ex parte in English against the workman. Thereafter the Disciplinary Authority passed the order of dismissal from service w.e.f. 10-8-94. It is stated that the workman was acquitted in the criminal case by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Ujjain on 17-9-97. It is stated that the workman did not get opportunity to defend himself in the departmental proceeding. It is submitted that the impugned order of dismissal dated 10-8-94 is illegal and unjustified and be set aside with back wages.

3. The management appeared and filed Written Statement in the case. The case of the management, inter alia, is that the workman Shri Hari Singh Movel was working as a clerk in Ghonsala Branch of UCO Bank. He was suspended by the Divisional Manager, Indore vide order dated 21-9-92 with immediate effect. He was served with a chargesheet dated 24-3-93 for committing serious misconduct. The Enquiry Officer conducted the enquiry and submitted his report holding him guilty of the charges. The workman was showcaused for the proposed punishment of termination from service. The workman was personally heard and also filed Written reply before the Disciplinary Authority. The Disciplinary Authority passed the order of dismissal from service vide order dated 10-8-94. Thereafter the workman raised the industrial dispute before the Labour enforcement Officer (Central), Indore (in short LEO Indore), on 13-8-94. It is stated that in the meantime the Head Office, Calcutta directed the Divisional Manager, Indore vide order dt. 6-2-96, who was Disciplinary Authority, to conduct a fresh enquiry against the workman and to pass order accordingly. It is stated that the order of re-enquiry superseded the order of dismissal dated 10-8-94 and it is now non-est, without any existence and infructuous. The workman had not brought this fact before the LEO (Central) Indore and as a result of this reference. It is stated that the workman was very much in service and the order of dismissal dated 10-8-94 was automatically cancelled on the order of fresh enquiry of the alleged charges in Hindi. This fact is accepted by the workman on receiving subsistence allowance till 8-9-1997 and he was treated under suspension from 21-9-92 to 8-9-97. Thereafter on due enquiry he was again terminated from service from 8-9-1997. It is submitted that the present reference is infructuous and the reference be answered accordingly.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are settled for adjudication—

- I. Whether the action of the management in terminating the workman w.e.f. 10-8-94 is legal and justified?
- II. To what relief the workman is entitled?

5. According to the workman, he was terminated on 10-8-94 illegally without giving opportunity to defend

himself. Moreover a criminal case was pending and therefore the departmental enquiry cannot be proceeded without disposal of the criminal proceeding in terms of settlement whereas the management has contended that now the termination order dated 10-8-94 was not in existence after initiation of fresh enquiry on the charges and it is automatically deemed to be terminated.

6. This reference is only with respect to the termination dated 10-8-94 and is not with respect to the termination dated 8-9-1997. The dismissal dated 10-8-94 is said by the management that it was cancelled automatically after initiation of fresh enquiry on the same charges against the workman. Now let us examine the evidence of the parties as to whether the termination order dated 10-8-94 was cancelled or not. If it was not cancelled then management was not entitled to conduct enquiry against the workman afresh because the relationship of employer and employee was ended. The workman Shri Hari Singh Movel is examined in the case. He has supported his case that he was terminated vide order dated 10-8-94 with immediate effect. In para 15 he has stated that the workman was informed vide order dated 6-2-1996 of Divisional Manager, UCO Bank, Indore that the departmental enquiry is to be held afresh in Hindi and accordingly Shri S.M. Dabkara was appointed as Enquiry Officer. This clearly shows that the termination order dated 10-8-94 was deemed to be cancelled, otherwise the management was not in a position to conduct the enquiry afresh. He has admitted at para 43 that he got subsistence allowance from 10-8-94 to 31-1-96 and on 9-7-96, he got full pay. This itself shows that termination order dated 10-8-94 was cancelled and he was treated under suspension. The workman appears to have acknowledged by accepting subsistence allowance. The evidence of the workman corroborates the fact that the order dated 10-8-94 of termination was already deemed to be cancelled on the order of fresh enquiry.

7. The workman has filed certain documents which are admitted by the management. Exhibit W/1 is the failure report dt. 21-8-95 of LEO(C) Indore to the Ministry. This is filed to show that conciliation was failed between the parties and therefore this reference. Exhibit W/2 is this reference order. Exhibit W/3 is a letter dated 30-5-96 to Divisional Manager, UCO Bank, Indore by Shri Ram Nagwanshi with respect to stay the departmental proceeding in view of criminal proceeding pending in Court. This letter itself shows that the workman had knowledge and had participated in the fresh departmental enquiry on the charges. This shows that the dismissal order dated 10-8-94 was deemed to have been cancelled and thereafter the fresh enquiry was initiated on the same charges. Exhibit W/4 is the order dated 31-10-96 of the Hon'ble High Court passed in Writ Petition No. 1075/98 whereby the notice was issued to the respondent/management. This is filed to show that the workman challenged that the criminal proceeding and departmental enquiry cannot be started simultaneously.



This is not relating to the dismissal order dated 10-8-94. Exhibit W/5 is the order dated 8-9-97 whereby the workman was again terminated after fresh enquiry. This order is not under consideration. Thus the documentary evidence adduced by the union clearly shows that after termination dated 10-8-94, the fresh proceeding was again started against the workman. This itself shows that the order dated 10-8-94 is not in existence and therefore the question to consider legality and justification of the order dated 10-8-94 does not arise.

8. On the other hand, the management has adduced evidence in the case. The management witness Shri P.S. Pathak is working as Manager, UCO Bank, Ghonsala Branch. He has also supported the fact that a fresh enquiry was initiated on the same charges after the alleged order dated 10-8-94 and the workman was paid subsistence allowance during fresh enquiry. He has stated that dismissal order dated 10-8-94 is non-est, without any existence and infructuous. It is clear that a formal order was not passed by the management before directing the competent authority to conduct fresh enquiry. However it appears to be an implied meaning on giving direction for conducting the departmental enquiry afresh that the order of dismissal dated 10-8-94 was set-aside by the Authority.

9. The management has also adduced documentary evidence. Exhibit M/1 is a letter dated 4-11-1995 by Asstt. General Manager (Adm.), Calcutta to the Union whereby it was informed that a fresh enquiry is to be conducted on the chargesheet dated 24-4-93. This is filed to show that the punishment order dated 10-8-94 was impliedly cancelled and a fresh enquiry was being conducted. Exhibit M/2 is the letter dated 18-11-1995 issued by Asstt. General Manager (Adm.) Indore to Branch Manager informing him that a fresh enquiry in Hindi is to be conducted on the said charge sheet dated 24-4-93 and the workman be paid subsistence allowance. This is filed to show that the period of fresh enquiry was also considered under suspension. Exhibit M/3 is letter to the workman whereby he was informed that he is entitled to subsistence allowance during fresh enquiry. Exhibit M/4 is the letter dated 9-3-96 whereby it was informed to the workman that the amounts of subsistence allowance was deposited in his accounts of the Bank. Exhibit M/5 is the letter dated 9-7-96 by the Manager to the workman whereby a Bankers cheque of amount of subsistence allowance and other allowance was given to the workman. Thus the documentary evidence also shows that a formal cancellation order of dismissal dated 10-8-94 was not passed by the management before conducting a fresh enquiry on the same charges. However it is clear that the workman had participated in the fresh enquiry and also received subsistence allowance which shows that the dismissal order 10-8-94 was deemed to have been cancelled. Thus it is clear that there is no dispute in existence between the parties with respect to the dismissal order dated 10-8-94. This issue is decided accordingly.

## 10. Issue No. II

On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the dismissal order dated 10-8-94 was not in existence after initiation of fresh enquiry against the workman on the same charges. Thus the workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is accordingly answered.

11. In the result, the award is passed without any costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3133.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/42/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/11/2007-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

S.O. 3133.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/42/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Nagpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Disputes between the employers in relation to the management BANK OF INDIA and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/11/2007-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI J. P. CHAND, PRESIDING OFFICER.  
CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR

Case No. CGIT/NGP/42/2007 date : 05-09-2012

Party No. 1 : The Chief Manager, (SS&P)  
Bank of India, Zonal Office,  
S. V. Patel Marg, Post Box -4, Nagpur-1

## Versus

Party No. 2 : Shri Parmanand Dubey,  
R/o. Manas Bhawan,  
Khandelwal Nagar,  
Behind S.T.V. Colony, Akola (MS)

**AWARD**

(Dated: 5th September, 2012)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government has referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Bank of India and their workman, Shri Parmanand Dubey, for adjudication, as per letter No. L-12012/11/2007-IR (B-II) dated 06-07-2007, with the following schedule :—

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of India through its Chief Manager (CS&P), Zonal Office, S.V.Patel Road, Nagpur in awarding the punishment of dismissal of Shri Parmanand M. Dubey from Bank's service without notice vide order dated 14-02-2002 is legal and justified and whether the workman is entitled to be reinstated in the service of the Bank with full back wages and all consequential benefits? If not, what relief is the workman is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, parties were noticed to file their respective statement of claim and written statement, in response to which, the workman Shri Parmanand Dubey, ("the workman" in short) filed the statement of claim and the management of Bank of India ("party no. 1" in short) filed the written statement.

The case of the workman as projected in the statement of claim is that he came to be appointed in the services of Bank of India, as a clerk w.e.f. 17-04-1980 and was posted to Akola Branch and subsequently, he was transferred to Bhide branch in Wardha District and in the year 2001, he was transferred to Dewrankar Nagar Branch at Amravati, and while working in the said branch, charge sheet dated 05-09-2001. containing one charge was served on him, on the allegation that he abused his official position and on 09-02-2001 prevailed upon M/s. Shakambari Industries, an account holder of the said branch to issue a cheque for Rs. 50,000 in favour of M/s. Hotel Surbhi and credited the said amount to the cash credit account of M/s. Hotel Surbhi on 09-02-2001 and on 31-03-2001, he prevailed upon M/s. Ajinkya Marketing for issuing SDR for 15 days for Rs. 50,000 in favour of M/s. Ajinkya Marketing and instead of SDR, he unauthorisedly prepared a pay order for Rs. 50,000 in the name of M/s. Shakambari Industry and also managed to get the said amount deposited in the account of M/s. Shakambari Industries and the said Acts were done by him to settle personal liabilities with M/s. Shakambari Industries and Shri Agrekar was appointed as the enquiry officer to conduct the enquiry against him and the enquiry was not fair and the same was conducted by the enquiry officer without giving him proper and adequate opportunity of defence and though on 23-10-2001, he had prayed for adjournment of the enquiry

by sending a telegram, due to his illness and the said telegram was received by the enquiry officer before proceeding with the enquiry, the enquiry officer proceeded with the case ex-parte and recorded the evidence of five witnesses and majority of the questions put to the witnesses were leading questions and the enquiry officer allowed such questions in his absence and the enquiry officer instead of acting as the enquiry officer, practically played the role of the prosecutor and asked questions to majority of the witnesses to fill-in the gaps in the evidence produced by the presenting officer and the witnesses were not subjected to cross-examination on subsequent dates and the said facts demonstrate that conduction of enquiry was not fair and recording of evidence in his absence was clear denial of reasonable opportunity of defence and the same is total breach of natural justice. The further case of the workman is that the findings given by the enquiry officer are perverse and the enquiry officer lost sight of the principles that burden of proving the charges, on the basis of evidence is on the management and there is no evidence on record to establish his guilt or negligence or that his act or acts were prejudicial to the interest of the bank and in absence of such evidence, the finding of the enquiry officer that the charges had been proved is nothing but an empty formality and the conclusions drawn by the enquiry officer are most casual and prejudicial and are not based on the evidence on record and the findings are based on conjunctures and surmises and the enquiry officer did not appreciate and consider the evidence led on his behalf and the Disciplinary Authority as well as the Appellate Authority committed serious error accepting the perverse findings of the enquiry officer and unjustifiedly awarded shockingly disproportionate punishment of dismissal from services upon him and his past service records were not considered before imposing of the punishment and therefore, the punishment is unjustified. The workman has further mentioned that in the terms of reference, the date of his dismissal from services has been mentioned as 14-02-2002, but actually, the date of his dismissal is 11-02-2002. The workman has prayed to declare the order of his dismissal from service dated 11-02-2002 to be illegal and unjustified and to set aside the same and to reinstate him in service with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. The party no. 1 in their written statement has pleaded inter-alia that charge sheet came to be issued against the workman on 05-09-2001 and Shri M.R. Agrekar was appointed as the enquiry officer to conduct the enquiry and the enquiry officer submitted the enquiry report to the disciplinary authority on 14-12-2001 and the disciplinary authority *vide* his order dated 11-02-2002 imposed the punishment of dismissal from services without notice, against the workman, in terms of clause 21 (iv) (a) of the Bi-partite Settlement and the workman filed an appeal challenging the order of dismissal dated 11-02-2002, before

the appellate authority and the appellate authority after granting an opportunity of hearing to the workman, dismissed the appeal vide its order dated 08-04-2002 and the misconduct was mentioned in detail in the chargesheet dated 05-09-2001 and the enquiry conducted against the workman was fair and he was given proper and adequate opportunity to defend himself. The further case of the party no.1 is that the enquiry officer fixed the enquiry proceedings on 12-10-2001 and the workman and the management representative appeared before the enquiry officer and the presenting officer tendered documents along with list of witnesses and the same was taken on record in presence of and with due consent of the workman and thereafter, the enquiry was adjourned to 19-10-2001, at the request of the workman and on 19-10-2001, the workman requested for adjournment to engage defence representative and the enquiry officer granted time with a condition that no further adjournment would be granted in any case and the enquiry was posted to 23-10-2001 and on 23-10-2001, management witnesses were present before the enquiry officer and the workman with the intention to delay the proceedings issued a telegram addressed to the enquiry officer to adjourn the enquiry, on the ground of his not keeping well and the enquiry officer considered the fact that the witnesses were outsiders and were summoned and they were present and as such, the enquiry officer proceeded with the enquiry and permitted the management representative to examine the witnesses and the principles of evidence Act are not applicable in such a case and the allegation that the enquiry officer permitted the management representative to ask leading questions to the witnesses and that the enquiry officer played the role of prosecutor are false and denied. It is also pleaded by party no.1 that the enquiry officer adjourned the case to 02-11-2001, after recording the evidence of the witnesses on 23-10-2001 and on 02-11-2001, the workman appeared in the enquiry with his defence representative, Shri S.R. Bobhate and each and every request made by the defence representative was granted by the enquiry officer and the copy of the enquiry proceedings and copies of depositions recorded on 23-10-2001 were supplied to the workman and the enquiry officer asked the defence representative to verify the documents and the defence representative was allowed to verify the documents and being asked by the enquiry officer, the defence representative expressed to make cross-examination of the witnesses no. 2, 3 and 4 of the management and accordingly, the defence representative was permitted to cross-examine the said three witnesses and the departmental enquiry was conducted fairly and in accordance with the principles of natural justice and the workman was given every opportunity to defend himself and the findings of the enquiry officer are not perverse and the findings are based on evidence on record and not based on conjecture and surmises and the charge mentioned in the charge sheet dated 05-09-2001 was specific enough to demonstrate the involvement of the workman and the same

was duly proved in the departmental enquiry and the findings of the enquiry officer are perfectly legal, justified and in consonance with the materials placed on record during the enquiry and the disciplinary authority and the appellate authority did not commit any error by accepting the findings of the enquiry officer and the punishment is not shockingly disproportionate to the misconduct and the workman is not entitled for any relief.

4. As this is a case of dismissal of the workman from services, after holding a departmental enquiry, the validity of the departmental enquiry was taken as a preliminary issue for consideration and by order dated 22-03-2012, the departmental enquiry conducted against the workman was held to be legal, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice.

5. During the course of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the workman that the Branch Manager, Akola Bank sanctioned loan of Rs. 1.65 lakhs illegally to M/s. Kabra Udyog and M/s. Kabra Dal and Oil Mill and the workman, who was working in loan sanction made complaint about the same to the CBI and as such, he was made a scapegoat and he was transferred from Akola to Amravati and a fraudulent charge sheet was submitted against him and no legal evidence was adduced by the management to prove the charge against the workman there was no evaluation of the evidence by the enquiry officer and no reason has been assigned by the enquiry officer in support of the findings and the defence evidence was not taken by him into consideration and as such, the findings are perverse and the past record of the workman was not considered at the time of imposition of the punishment and the punishment imposed against the workman is shockingly disproportionate and the workman is entitled to reinstatement in service with all consequential benefits.

6. Per contra, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the party no.1 that the workman abused his official position and to the detrimental of the interest of the Bank, on 09-02-2001, prevailed upon, M/s. Shakambari Industries, a customer of the Bank and managed to get issued a cheque for Rs. 50,000 in favour of M/s. Hotel Surabhi and credited the said amount to cash credit account of M/s. Hotel Surabhi on the same day and on 31-03-2001, the workman prevailed upon M/s. Ajinkya Marketing, a sister concerned of M/s. Hotel Surabhi and managed to get issued a cheque for Rs. 50,000 purportedly for issuing SDR for 15 days in their favour and instead of preparing the SDR in favour of M/s. Ajinkya Marketing, he unauthorisedly prepared a pay order for Rs. 50,000 in favour of M/s. Shakambari Industries and managed to get the amount deposited in the said account and fraudulently misappropriated the said amount to settle his liabilities with M/s. Shakambari Industries and the workman committed a grave misconduct within the meaning of para 19.5 (j) of the Bipartite Settlement and for that he was charge sheeted and in the disciplinary



proceedings, he was found guilty of the charges by the enquiry officer and the findings of the enquiry officer are based on the evidence adduced in the disciplinary proceedings and the enquiry officer has given his findings by analyzing the evidence in a rational manner and assigning cogent reasons for arriving at the findings and the findings of the enquiry officer are not at all perverse. It was submitted further by the learned advocate for the party no. 1 that unless and until the punishment is found wholly disproportionate to the misconduct proved, there is no scope for the Tribunal normally to interfere with the punishment and serious misconduct of misappropriation of money has been proved against the workman, who was working as a clerk in the bank and the bank has lost confidence in the workman and as such, the dismissal of the workman from services is just and proper and in a case of misappropriation, there is need to consider the past record of the employee while imposing the sentence.

In support of such contentions, the learned advocate for party no. 1 placed reliance on the decisions reported on AIR 2000 SC 3219 (Janatha Bazar Vs. Secretary, Sahakari Nonarana Sangh), AIR 2004 SC-4828 (Regional Manager, Rajasthan S.R.T.C Vs. Sohanlal), 2012 (2) Bom. C.R. 47 (Asarm Dagduji Pawar Vs. Divisional Controller, M.S.R.T.C.), AIR 2006 SC 2730 (Divisional Controller, NEKRTC Vs. H. Amresh), 2008 (1) SCC-115 (UPSRTC Vs. Vinod Kumar) and 2010 (4) Supreme 498 (UPSRTC Vs. Suresh Chand Sharma).

7. Before delving into the merit of the case, I think it apropos to mention about the principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Courts in the decisions cited by the learned advocate for the party no. 1.

In the decision reported in AIR 2000 SC-3219 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that:

“Industrial Disputes Act (14 of 1947), Sch. 2, Items 3, S. 11-A-Reinstatement-Charges of breach of trust and misappropriation of goods established-Reinstating the employee in service, unjustified-Fact that misappropriation is for small or large amounts, or that past record of employee is unblemished, irrelevant.”

8. In the judgment reported in AIR 2004 SC- 4828 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that :

“(B) Constitution of India, Art. 311- Road Transport Corporations Act (64 of 1950), S. 45-Interference with quantum of sentence awarded-Termination of service on ground of misconduct-Unless sentence is wholly disproportionate to misconduct proved-Superior Courts should not normally interfere.

(C) Constitution of India, Art. 311—Dismissal from service—Loss of confidence—Misconduct by delinquent conductor of not issuing tickets to passengers—Since misconduct proved is one of dishonesty—quantum of monetary loss is immaterial and it is loss of confidence in workman that matters—Dismissal proper.

9. In the judgment reported in 2012 (2) Bom.C.R.-47 (Supra), the Hon'ble High Court have held that :

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Sec 11-A- Reissue of bus ticket-Petitioner was served with charge sheet alleging he has reissued ticket-Further alleged tickets were found in bag of petitioner- Enquiry conducted-Spot statement and statement of enquiry recorded-Petitioner submits after two years of incident enquiry started there was violation of rules and principles of natural justice-Petitioner dismissed from services—Petitioner filed dispute before Labour Court and reference made under provision of Act—Learned Labour Court rejected same hence this petition—Petitioner submits Labour Court failed to give benefit of provision of section 11-A of Act—Held, Court found, nothing has demonstrated to hold findings recorded by Labour Court are perverse in any manner. Absence of petitioner before Labour Court during crucial period i.e. at time of recording of evidence and filing of pursis before Labour Court shows he had no case and conveniently remained absent. Petitioner not availed opportunity to participate either in enquiry or before Labour Court at crucial stage. Misconduct of petitioner proved. Hon'ble Supreme Court held in 2000 DGLS (Soft.) 1452, amount small or large is not question of showing uncalled for sympathy. Petitioner admitted Rs. 14.50 was found less in spot statement. No case is made out for interference.”

10. In the judgment reported in AIR 2006 SC-2730 (Supra), the Hon 'ble Apex Court have held that:

“Service Law. Dismissal. Reinstatement. Misconduct by conductor on duty in drunken state Misappropriation of funds. Charges of pilferage was established against the respondent. Workman such misconduct is grave and has the effect of disrupting the services of a public transport system—Loss of confidence as the primary factor and not the amount of money mis-appropriated and that the sympathy or generosity cannot be a factor which is impermissible in law. When an employee is found guilty of pilferage or of misappropriating a Corporation's funds, there is nothing wrong in the Corporation losing confidence or faith in such an employee and awarding punishment of dismissal-Direction to appellatant Corporation to immediately discharge the respondent from service. Appeal allowed. Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Article 311 of the Constitution of India.”

11. In the judgment reported in 2008(1) SCC -115 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that :

“Labour Law—Departmental Proceedings Misappropriation—Conclusions of Enquiry Officer and quantum of Punishment—Challenge without there being any



challenge to legality or fairness of the enquiry report-Labour Court, on the findings that the charges of misappropriation not being proved, the punishment of removal was harsh accordingly, reduced the punishment to stoppage of one increment without any cumulative effect and directed reinstatement with full bank wages- In absence of challenge to the enquiry report, the Labour Court should be reluctant to interfere with the findings of the Punishment Authority or the quantum of punishment. Where the employer has lost confidence, there is no scope for misplaced sympathy to interfere with the quantum of punishment. Appeal allowed- Impugned order set aside."

12. In the judgment reported in 2010 (4) Supreme- 498 (Supra), the Hon'ble Apex Court have held that:

"Service & Labour Laws-Termination-Reinstatement ordered by High Court-Non-issuance of tickets by bus conductor on payment by passengers. No fault could be found with the Award of the Labour Court and it was not necessary for the checking authority to record the evidence of the passengers who were found travelling without tickets nor it was necessary to check the cash at the hand of the employee. The High Court misdirected itself while setting aside the well-reasoned Award of the Labour Court without giving any reason whatsoever- Enquiry officer has rightly appreciated the evidence and found the charges proved in respect of both the incidents. The Disciplinary Authority has taken a right decision accepting the enquiry report and punishment order was passed after serving second show cause to the employee. There was an intention to misappropriate the fare recovered from the passengers who were found travelling without tickets at both the times- No reason awarded by High Court while reversing the decision of Labour Court-Impugned judgment and order set aside- In a case of corruption/misappropriation the only punishment is dismissal—Appeal of corporation allowed."

13. At this juncture, I think it necessary to mention that it is consistently held and accepted by the Hon'ble Apex court that strict rules of evidence are not applicable to the proceedings, before the Labour Court/Tribunal. It is also well settled that the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to interfere with the disciplinary matters or punishment cannot be equated with an appellate jurisdiction and the Tribunal cannot interfere with the findings of the enquiry officer or competent authority where they are not arbitrary or utterly perverse. The power to impose penalty on a delinquent officer is conferred on the competent authority either by an act of legislature or rules made under the provision of Art. 309 of the Constitution. If there has been an enquiry consistent with the rules and in accordance with principles of natural justice what punishment would meet the ends of justice is a matter exclusively within the jurisdiction of the competent authority. It the penalty can lawfully be imposed

and is imposed on the proved misconduct, the Tribunal has no power to substitute its own discretion for that of the authority. The adequacy of penalty unless it is malafide is certainly not a matter for the Tribunal to concern itself with. The Tribunal also cannot interfere with the penalty if the conclusion of the enquiry officer or the competent authority is based on evidence. It is also well settled that a disciplinary proceeding is not a criminal trial and the standard or proof required is that of preponderance of probability and not proof beyond reasonable doubt.

14. So, keeping in view the principles settled by the Hon'ble Courts in the decisions mentioned above and the settled principles regarding the power of the Tribunal to interfere with the findings and punishment imposed by the authorities in a departmental enquiry, now, the present case in hand is to be considered.

15. So far the contention raised by the learned advocate for the workman regarding submission of a fraudulent charge sheet against the workman and making him a scapegoat due to his lodging a complaint to the CBI against in the Branch Manager for illegal sanction of loan is concerned, on perusal of the documents, it is found that there is no force at all in such contentions. The copy of the complaint filed by the workman with the CBI has been marked as Ext. W-XI. On perusal of Ext. W-XI, it is found that the said complaint was filed by the workman on 03-03-2006, about four years after his dismissal from service. There is no evidence on record to show that the workman had lodged any complaint against the Branch Manager prior to the submission of the charge sheet and that the workman was made a scapegoat. Hence, the contention of the learned advocate for the workman on that score fails.

16. In this case, after going through the materials on record including the documents relating to the domestic enquiry held against the workman, it is found that to prove the charge against the workman, management has examined six witnesses and also produced twelve documents including the documents regarding the transactions made by the workman as mentioned in the charge sheet. It is also found that the enquiry officer has dealt with the allegations made against the workman systematically and he has assigned cogent reasons in support of his findings after analyzing the evidence. The findings of the enquiry officer are based on the evidence adduced in the enquiry. From the materials on record, it also cannot be said that this is a case of no evidence and the findings given by the enquiry officer cannot be arrived at by a prudent man on the evidence available on record. Hence, the findings of the enquiry officer cannot be said to be perverse.

17. In the instant case, the workman was found guilty of misappropriating the customers fund, so, there was nothing wrong in the Bank losing confidence or faith in such an employee and awarding punishment of dismissal. In such cases, there is no place for generosity or misplaced sympathy and to interfere with the quantum of punishment.

18. Applying the principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Courts as mentioned in the decisions cited by the learned advocate for the party no. 1 to the case in hand, it is found that there was no necessity for the disciplinary authority to consider the past record of the workman, while imposing the punishment. The punishment of dismissal of the workman from services cannot be said to be not commensurate with the misconduct, proved against him in a properly conducted departmental enquiry.

From the materials on record and the discussions made above, it is found that there is no ground to interfere with the punishment imposed against the workman. Hence, it is ordered:—

### ORDER

The action of the management of Bank of India through its Chief Manager (CS & P), Zonal Office, S. V. Patel Road, Nagpur in awarding the punishment of dismissal of Shri Parmanand M. Dubey from Bank's service without notice vide order dated 11-02-2002 (wrongly mentioned as 14-02-2002 on schedule of reference) is legal and justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief.

J.P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3134.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स सतना स्टोन एंड लाईम कंपनी लिमिटेड, कोलकाता के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 75, 76, 77, 78, 79/2008) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/50, 51, 52, 53, 54/2008-आई आर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3134.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 75,76,77,78 and 79/2008) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Satna Stone Lime Co. Ltd. (Kolkata) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-9-2012.

[No. L-29012/50,51,52,53,54/2008-IR (M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

### ANNEXURE BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

Presiding Officer : SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN  
Case No. CGIT/LC/R/75/08, 76/08, 77/08, 78/08 and 79/08

Shri Ram Saroj Kushwaha,  
General Secretary,  
AITUC Distt. Parishad,  
AITUC Office, Sidharth Nagar,  
Post Birla Vikas,  
Distt. Satna (MP)

... Workman/Union

### Versus

The Managing Director,  
Satna Stone Lime Co. Ltd.,  
6, Middle Road, Hasting,  
Kolkata

... Management

### AWARD

Passed on this 7th day of August, 2012

1. (a) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-29012(50)/2008-IR(M) dated 10-6-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

"Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone and Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

"Whether the action of Satna Stone and Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17-8-2000 to Smt. Chhoti Kolin W/o Shri Ramnath Kaul and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

(b) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-29012(51)/2008-IR(M) dated 10-6-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

"Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone and Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

"Whether the action of Satna Stone and Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17-8-2000 to Smt. Ramkali Kolin W/o Shri Ramnath Kaul and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

(c) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-29012(52)/2008-IR(M) dated 10-6-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

"Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone and Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

“Whether the action of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17- 8-2000 to Smt.Nihlwa Kolin W/o. Shri Ramdass Kaul and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

(d) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-29012(53)/2008-IR(M) dated 10-6-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:-

"Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

"Whether the action of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17- 8-2000 to Shri Ramdas Kaul S/o Shri Guljari Kaul and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

(e) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-29012(54)/2008-IR(M) dated 10-6-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:-

“Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?”

“Whether the action of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna, MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17- 8-2000 to Shri Ganga Kaul S/o Shri Ramdayal Kaul and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. All the five reference cases are taken up together as all are on a common subject-matter and are interconnected with each other.

3. The Union/workmen do not appear inspite of notice by registered post. It appears that sufficient time was granted to file statement of claim and the document in the case but neither the statement of claim nor any document is filed in the case. This shows that now there is no industrial dispute in existence between the parties. As such the Union/workmen are not appearing in the case.

4. The management has also been noticed by registered post but the management has also not responded in the case. This aspect also shows that there is now no dispute left between the parties. Thus this is a case of no dispute. It appears that there is no use to keep the references pending when proper notices are sent by registered post and they are not appearing to contest the references. I find that this is a case of no dispute. Accordingly the references are answered.

5. In the result, a common no dispute award is passed in all the references without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3135.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स सतना स्टोन एंड लाईम कंपनी लिमिटेड, कोलकाता के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 21,22 एवम 41/2008) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/16,17/2008-आई.आर. (एम)

सं. एल 29012/69/2007-आईआर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3135.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 21,22 & 41/2008) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jabalpur now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Satna Stone Lime Co. Ltd. (Kolkata) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 13-09-2012.

[No. L-29012/16,17/2008-IR (M) &  
No. L-29012/69/2007-IR (M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

Presiding Officer: SHRI MOHD.SHAKIR HASAN

Case No. CGIT/LC/R/21/08, 22/08 & 41/08

Shri Ram Saroj Kushwaha,

General Secretary,

AITUC Distt. Parishad,

AITUC Office, Sidharth Nagar, Post Birla Vikas,

Distt. Satna (MP)

...Workman/Union

#### Versus

The Managing Director,

Satna Stone Lime Co. Ltd., 6, Middle Road, Hasting,

Kolkata

...Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 13th day of August, 2012

1. (a) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-29012(16)/2007-IR(M) dated 4-3-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

" Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

" Whether the action of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17-8-2000 to Shri Guljhari Kaul and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

(b) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-29012(17)/2008-IR(M) dated 4-3-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

" Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

" Whether the action of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17-8-2000 to Shri Sidhha Kori S/o Shri Matadin Kori and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

(c) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-29012(69)/2007-IR(M) dated 25-2-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:-

" Whether the lock-out of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Madhya Pradesh w.e.f. 17-8-2000 was legal or not?"

" Whether the action of Satna Stone & Lime Company Ltd., Siding, Satna MP in not paying wages w.e.f. 1-5-2000 to 17-8-2000 to Shri Saukhilal Kushwaha S/o Shri Sadhu Kushwaha and bonus and retrenchment compensation for the period 1999 to 2001 is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. All the three reference cases are taken up together as all are on a common subject matter and are interconnected with each other.

3. In these cases, the Union/workmen did not appear inspite of proper notices by registered post. It appears that sufficient times are granted to appear and to raise the dispute. This shows that now there is no dispute of these workmen with the management and therefore they have chosen for not appearing in court. Thus this is a case of no dispute.

4. On the other hand, the management has also not appeared in the case inspite of notice. This aspect also

supports the fact that now there is no dispute between the parties and therefore they are not appearing inspite of four years pendency of the case. I do not find any reason to keep these cases pending. Accordingly the references are answered.

5. In the result, a common no dispute award is passed in all the references without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3136.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 22/2011) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

सं. एल-12011/35/2010-आई.आर.(बी-I)

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th September, 2012

**S.O. 3136.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref.22/2011) of the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Reserve Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 17-09-2012.

[No. L-12011/35/2010-IR(B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR**

**NO. CGIT/LC/R/22/2011**

Presiding Officer : SHRI MOHD.SHAKIR HASAN

The Secretary,

Reserve Bank of India Employees Association,

C/o RBI, P.B.No.32, Hoshangabad Road,

Bhopal (MP)

...Workman/Union



**Versus**

The General Manager, Reserve Bank of India,  
Hoshangabad Road, Bhopal (MP)

Regional Director,

Reserve Bank of India, DAPM Department,

P.B.No. 32, Hoshangabad Road,

Bhopal (MP)

... Management

**AWARD**

Passed on this 31st day of August, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-12011/35/2010-IR(B-I) dated 1-4-2011 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Reserve Bank of India, Bhopal in deputing Grade-A Officers *i.e.* non-Class-III employees remittance duty *vide* their order dated 11-11-2009 without consulting the Union is violation of Section 9A of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 and, is legal and justified? To what relief the Union is entitled?”

2. The case of the Union in short is that the Union has challenged the unilateral and arbitrary order of the management dated 11-11-2009 whereby the Assistant Manager/Assistant Treasurers were deputing for accompanying remittance of treasure to various currency chests without consulting the Union as well as without issuance of notice as required under Section 9A of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (in short the Act, 1947). The currency management is one of the functions of the Reserve Bank of India as laid down in the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934. It is stated that each category of Bank staff has specific job profile. The issuance of fresh notes to currency chests from the vault of the Bank is carried out by means of remittance, accompanied by the representative of the cash department who should be a Coin/Note Examiner/Assistant Grade- I or Grade II belonging to class III Cadre deputed for remittance duty since the inception of the Bank. The management issued a letter dated 26-9-07 that whenever Class III employee is not available, Assistant Treasurer (Grade A) may be deputed for remittance. It is stated that it is an attempt of changing the classification grades or change in usage which comes under schedule-IVth of the Act, 1947. It is submitted that the management be directed to restore the *status-quo* for remittance duty.

3. The management appeared and filed Written statement. The case of the management, *inter alia*, is that the deputation of Assistant Treasurers Grade A officers in case of non-availability of class III employees do not involve change of service conditions of class III employees as such duty does not fall under any of the service conditions specified in fourth schedule of the Act, 1947 and therefore the question of issue of notice under Section 9A of the Act, 1947 does not arise. The term Banks Representatives accompanying the remittance has been used without specifying any grade/class to which representative should belong in the departmental manual. Whenever remittances are arranged by offices generally preference is given to class III employees for remittance duty. However offices have been advised *vide* letter DCM(RMMT) 2243/11-04-09/2007-08 dated 26-9-2007 to depute Assistant treasurers (grade A) only if class III employees are not available for accompanying the remittance. There are 272 currency chests under the jurisdiction of Bhopal Office. It is stated that when all the available Class III employees are already on remittance duty, sometimes it may not be possible to send Class III employees as Bank's representative for remittance. It is submitted that in view of the above submission, the claim of the Union be rejected with costs.

4. During the pendency of the reference, the Union filed an application dated 3-8-2012 with affidavit praying therein to dispose off the case as not pressed any more. The management has no objection if no dispute award is passed.

5. Perused the application. Heard both the parties. The Union representative has submitted that after submission of the statement of claim, the parties have discussed the matter with regard to the dispute in reference and some positive and constructive results have emerged out. As a result an advertisement for recruitment of class III staff is published and class III employees are being deputed for remittance duty again. It is stated that the discussions are still in the process. As such the case be disposed off as not pressed without prejudice to the contents of the statement of claim.

6. Considering the above circumstances in the case, it is clear that the Union does not want to proceed with the case and it appears in the interest of justice the case be disposed off without prejudice to the contents of statement of claim. Accordingly the reference is answered.

7. In the result, no dispute award is passed without any order to costs.

8. Let. the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment as per rules.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3137.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डब्ल्यू.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट संदर्भ संख्या 90/2007 को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18.09.2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/129/2007-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी. एम. पटनायक, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O.3137.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award Ref. 90/2007 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of WCL, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18.09.2012.

[No. L-22012/129/2007-IR(CM-II)]

B.M. PATNAIK, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL-TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/90/2007

PRESIDING OFFICER: SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN

The General Secretary,

Samyukta Koyla Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC),

Central Office Iklehra,

Chhindwara

... Workman

#### Versus

The Chief General Manager,

WCL, Pench Area,

PO. Parasia,

Chhindwara

... Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 27th day of August, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour *vide*

its Notification No.L-22012/129/2007-IR(CM-II) dated 10.9.2007 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of WCL in refusing to convert Shri Jitai from Piece rated job to chowkidar or other surface job is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The Union/workman did not appear inspite of proper notice through registered post. Lastly the reference proceeded *ex parte* against the Union/workman on 21.7.2011.

3. The management appeared and filed Written Statement. The case of the management, in short, is that the workman Shri Jitai was employed as Tub loader and posted at Thesgora Mine of WCL, Pench Area. He met with an accident on 19.2.1996 and was treated at Colliery Hospital. After treatment he was declared fit for employment by the Medical Board. However the management provided him alternative job in time rated alongwith several other employees. The management sent a list to headquarter of those workers for conversion from loader to time rated. The Headquarter granted approval *vide* office order 633 dated 13-6-2002 but inadvertently the designation of the workman was shown as chowkidar instead of General Mazdoor. The Area management noticed the error of designation of the workman and the same was pointed out to the Headquarter *vide* letter dated 14-9-2002. Thereafter necessary order was passed correcting the mistake by showing the workman as General Mazdoor *vide* letter 1651 dated 16-10-2002. Accordingly an office order was passed by the Area Personnel Manager. It is stated that the workman had never worked as chowkidar. The workman did not possess the requisite qualification for the post of chowkidar. It is submitted that there is no merit in the demand of the workman.

4. On the basis of pleading of the management and reference order, the following issues are framed for adjudication:—

I. Whether the action of the management in refusing to convert the workman from piece rated to chowkidar or other surface job is legal and justified?

II. To what relief the workman is entitled?

#### 5. Issue No. I

To prove the case, the management has adduced oral

and documentary evidence. The management witness Shri Sukadev Seth is working as Personnel Manager in Nahariya Underground Mine of Pench Area of WCL. He has supported the case of the management that the workman was tub loader and met with an accident on 19.2.96. He was treated at Barkui Hospital and after fitness, the management provided him alternative job in the underground mine in time rated. He was not working as chowkidar. He was General Mazdoor at Underground Mine. His evidence clearly shows that he was piece rated as Tub Loader in the Underground and after accident, he was treated and when he became fit for duty he was given alternative job of time rated in the Underground mine. This shows that he was never posted as chowkidar in time rated. His evidence is unrebutted. There is no reason to disbelieve his evidence. He appears to be trust worthy.

6. The management has also adduced documentary evidence. Annexure M/1 is the accident slip. This is filed to show that the workman met with an accident on 19.2.1996 and he reported as back ache. Annexure M/2 is the letter dated 6.1.2006 of Dy.Chief Medical Officer to the Area Personnel Manager, Pench Area whereby he had informed that the workman was treated in 1998 and 1999 for back ache which was non-serious injury at Barkui Hospital. Annexure M/3 is the list forwarded by the Personnel Manager on 13.6.2002 to the Headquarter for conversion the workers from piece rated to time rated. The name of the workman stands at Sl.No.45. This is filed to show that by typing mistake it was indicated that the workman was working as Chowkidar. Annexure M/4 is the list sent by the Sr.Personnel officer to the Headquarter informing about the error committed in the earlier list sent for conversion from piece rated to time rated. The name of the workman is at Sl.No.10. This shows that it was rectified that he was General Mazdoor and was not a chowkidar. Annexure M/5 is the letter dated 14/16.10.2002 whereby the workman was converted from piece rated to time rated as General Mazdoor. Annexure M/7 is the Office order whereby the workman was converted from piece rated to time rated as General Mazdoor. There is no document to show that the workman was ever engaged as chowkidar or he was converted from piece rated to time rated as chowkidar. It appears that there was only error in recommending the

name of the workman showing him as chowkidar but no office order was passed accordingly rather the management rectified the mistake and accordingly office order was passed as General Mazdoor. The documentary evidence also shows that the management is justified in not converting the workman from piece rated to chowkidar or other surface job. This issue is decided in favour of the management and against the workman.

#### 7. Issue No. II

On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the action of the management is legal and justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is accordingly answered.

8. In the result, the award is passed without any order to costs.

9. Let the copies of the award be sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment as per rules.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3138.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उत्तर रेलवे के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, लखनऊ के पंचाट संदर्भ संख्या 38/2008 को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18.09.2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-41011/10/2008-आई आर (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3138.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 38/2008) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Northern Railway, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18.09.2012.

[No. L-41011/10/2008-IR(B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE****CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, LUCKNOW****PRESENT**

Dr. MANJU NIGAM

PRESIDING OFFICER

**I.D. No. 38/2008**

Ref. No. L-41011/10/2008-IR (B-I) dated: 23.06.2008

**BETWEEN**

The Divisional Secretary  
Uttar Railway Karmachari Union  
C/o Sri D.P. Awasthi  
49, Tilak Nagar, Aishbagh Road  
Lucknow.

(Espousing the cause of Shri B.P. Asthana)

**AND**

The Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer  
Northern Railway  
DRM Office  
Moradabad (U.P.)

**AWARD**

1. By order No. L-41011/10/2008-IR (B-I) dated: 23.06.2008 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, New Delhi in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred this industrial dispute between the Divisional Secretary, Uttar Railway Karmachari Union, C/o Sri D.P. Awasthi, 49, Tilak Nagar, Aishbagh Road, Lucknow and the Sr. Divisional Personnel Office, Northern Railway, DRM Office, Moradabad for adjudication.

2. The reference under adjudication is:

"WHETHER THE ACTION OF THE MANAGEMENT OF NORTHERN RAILWAY IN NOT GRANTING LEAVE ENCASHMENT OF 119 DAYS TO SRI B.P. ASTHANA, WAS LEGAL AND JUSTIFIED? IF NOT, WHAT RELIEF THE WORKMAN CONCERNED IS ENTITLED?"

3. The case of the workman's union, in brief, is that the workman, B.P. Asthana, was appointed in the Central Railway on 16.5.1966 and was promoted to the post of Assistant Station Master in 1974, then to the post of Station Master in the grade of Rs. 425-700 *w.e.f.* 1983 and subsequently to the next higher grade of Rs. 1600-2660 in the year 1993. It has been submitted by the workman's union that the workman became medically unfit and was medically decategorised and absorbed on the post of booking supervisor *vide* letter dated 13.06.2001. On

decategorisation the workman was given posting in the grade of Rs. 5500-9000 *vide* letter dated 3.12.2002 and he retired on 31.03.2003 at the basic pay of Rs. 7600/- per month. It has been alleged by the workman's union that under Rules the workman was entitled for leave encashment for 300 days but he was paid leave encashment for only 181 days, thus, he was deprived of leave encashment for 119 days. The workman's union has submitted that the workman fell ill and remained under treatment in Railway Hospitals at various stations from 04.05.1998 to 20.07.1998 for 78 days, from 29.07.1998 to 08.09.1998 for 42 days and from 01.01.2000 to 22.02.2000 for 53 days and on fitness he requested the management for commutation of his sick leave into HLAP account of the workman; but the management of the railway failed to commute his sick leave from HLAP and rather debited the entire sick leave from the accumulated balance of LAP, which adversely affected the out standing balance of LAP at the time of his retirement and consequently, he was given leave encashment for 181 days only. It has also been submitted by the workman's union that the workman submitted applications dated 10.10.1998 for commutation of sick leave for the period from 04.05.1998 to 20.07.1998 for 78 days and from 29.07.1998 to 08.09.1998 for 42 days; whereas he submitted applications dated 02.02.2003 and 27.02.2003 for commutation of entire sick leave. It has been alleged by the workman's union that the workman had 405 days sick leave at his credit and was entitled for having his 173 days medical leave commuted against LHAP as per directions contained in Railway Board's letter No. F(E) III/87, LE/1/2/ dated 08.03.88; but the management failed to comply with the directions of Railway Board, which caused him loss in leave encashment for 119 days; and accordingly, it has prayed that the workman may be held entitled for payment of 119 days leave encashment.

4. The management of the railways has denied the allegation leveled by the workman's union by filing its written statement; wherein it was submitted that the workman on being medically decategorised was found fit for the post of booking/parcel supervisor in the grade of Rs. 5500-9000 and further that the workman was working and was absorbed in the supervisory capacity and he draw wages exceeding to Rs. 1600/- per mensem. He was exercising his powers in the nature of supervisory duties attached to his office of booking/parcel supervisor. Since the duties and functions discharged by workman was mainly of a managerial nature hence the claimant is barred from raising the present industrial dispute in view of the provisions contained in the act. Beside the applicant is not a 'workman' as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Denying the allegations of the workman's union regarding non-encashment of 119 days leave encashment, the management has specifically submitted that the workman as not under the sick list during the alleged periods as per available records with the management, accordingly, the



leave encashment amount has been paid to the claimant. It has further stated that the claimant was not entitled to the leave encashment for the alleged period of 119 days as there had been no request to any authorities or the authority designated in that behalf by the management, within a period of 30 days of his joining his duty on the expiry of the relevant spell of leave availed by the claimant, if any. Beside that the claimant did not submit any sickness certificate as stated in his alleged application dated 10-10-98 and the same had never been submitted to the appropriate and competent authority. It was also contended by the management that the station superintendent, Roza Jn., N. Railway *vide* his letter dated 02-12-2006 has mentioned that the claimant joined on 10-09-98 at Roza on his transfer from Sandila Railway Station, who had not been under the sick list up to 22-02-2000 and as per available records and he was not under treatment of any Railway Doctor as the certificate to the effect were not produced by the claimant. Likewise, he never made any application for commutation before Competent Authority in as much as his claim is not maintainable in accordance to the P. S. No. 11546, issued by the Railway Board, which has been added in rule 505 of Indian Railway Establishment Code aft sub rule (1) w.e.f. 04-03-1998; and accordingly, it has been prayed that the claim of the workman's union for encashment of 119 days' leave may be rejected being devoid of merit and no relief be extended to the claimant concerned.

5. The workman's union has filed its rejoinder; wherein it has not brought any new fact apart from reiterating the averments already made by it in its statement of claim.

6. The workman's union has filed photocopy of following documents, in support of their claim:

- (i) Order dated 10-02-94, promotion him to the post of Asstt. Station Master, paper No. 9/6 to 9/11.
- (ii) Order dated: -/12/02 regarding transfer of the claimant, paper No. 9/12.
- (iii) Paper relating to OPD treatment, paper No. 9/13 to 9/15.
- (iv) Letter dated 11-08-98 referred B.P. Asthana, paper No. 9/16.
- (v) Requisition form for x-ray, paper No. 9/17.
- (vi) OPD slip dated 12-8-98, paper No. 9/18.
- (vii) Relieving letter dated 13-9-98, paper No. 9/19.
- (viii) Applications dated 10-10-98, 02-02-2003 and 27-02-2003 for adjustment and commutation of HLAP, paper No. 9/20 to 9/22.
- (ix) Typed copy of Railway Board's letter dated 08-03-88, paper No. 9/23.

The union also filed original leave record book in respect of B.P. Asthana, paper No. 10/2.

7. In rebuttal, the management filed photocopy of following document in support of their contention:

- (i) Letter dated 02-12-2006 of Station superintendent, Roza J., NR, paper No. M-14.
- (ii) Certificate dated 11-12-2006 of Station Superintendent, Sandila, NR, paper No. M-15.
- (iii) Order dated 16-09-2005 of Hon'ble CAT, in O.A. No. 78/2005, paper No. M-16.

8. The workman's union has examined the claimant in support of its case; whereas the management of railways has examined Shri Mangal Singh, Office Superintendent, Moradabad in support of their contentions. The parties cross-examined each other's witnesses. The management concluded its evidence on 30-03-2011 and since then the case is being listed for arguments; but the opposite party failed to forward any argument at one pretext or the other. However, the workman's union made their oral submissions in support of its pleadings. The case was reserved for award keeping in view the reluctance of the opposite party to argue their case and long pendency of the case since 2008.

9. Heard argument of the authorized representative of the workman's union and persued entire evidence on record.

10. The authorized representative of the union argued that B.P. Asthana on decategorisation was given posting in the grade of Rs. 5500-9000 on the post of booking/parcel supervisor at Northern Railway Station Sandila. He has argued that the workman in capacity of booking supervisor had to perform his duties on parcel counter and to prepare concession vouchers and maintain all routine record with his own hand. The workman was not authorized to give appointment. charge sheet or sanction leave to any one; accordingly, the nature of duties born by the workman were not of managerial or supervisory, though the nomenclature of the post included the word supervisor. Further, the representative of the workman's union has argued that the workman remained under sick leave and undergone treatment in the Railway hospitals for the period from 04-04-1998 to 20-07-1998 for 78 days and 29-07-1998 to 08-09-1998 for 42 days, for which he requested the management *vide* his application dated 10-10-98 to commute his sick leave into LHAP and further that the workman remained sick for the 01-01-2000 to 22-02-2000 for 53 days and he again submitted application *vide* dated 02-02-2003 and 27-02-2003 for commutation of sick leave into LHAP; but the management did not put any heed to it and derived the workman for facility provided under Rules for commutation of one kind of leave into other, which resulted into loss of leave encashment to the workman for 119 days.

11. Contrary to the submission of the workman's union the authorized representative has argued that the present industrial dispute is not maintainable for the reasons that the claimant does not fall within the purview of the definition of 'workman' as defined under Section 2 's' of the I.D. Act, 1947. Further, it has submitted that the claimant was not under the sick list during the alleged periods as per available

records with the management; accordingly, the leave encashment amount has been paid to the claimant as per available leave balance at his leave account. It has further urged that the claimant was not entitled to the leave encashment for the alleged period of 119 days as he never made any request to any authorities or the authority designated in that behalf by the management, within a period of 30 days of his joining his duty on the expiry of the relevant spell of leave availed by the claimant, if any. The representative further argued that the claimant did not submit any sickness certificate or application for commutation of sick leave. The management has contended that the claim of the claimant is not maintainable in accordance to the P .S. No. 11546, issued by the Railway Board, which has been added in rule 505 of Indian Railway Establishment Code aft sub rule (1) w.e.f. 04-03-1998.

12. I have given thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions of the parties and scanned entire evidence on record.

13. The management of the Railways has come out with the preliminary objection that the case, before this Tribunal, is not maintainable as the workman who was in supervisory capacity does not fall within the ambit of definition of Section 2 's' of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The union has opposed the submissions of the management and has submitted that though the nomenclature of the post included the word supervisor but the nature of duties were not at par with that of a supervisor or a manager. It has stated that while working on the post of booking/parcel supervisor at Northern Railway Station, Sandila, he had to perform duties on parcel counter and to prepare concession vouchers and maintain all routine record with his own hand. He was not authorized to give appointment, charge sheet or sanction leave to any one; accordingly, the nature of duties born by the workman were not of managerial or supervisory, though the nomenclature of the post included the word supervisor.

The management has not produced any documentary evidence in support of their objection that the nature of the duties of the workman were supervisory or managerial in nature. In its oral evidence, he has stated in his examination-in-chief that pay scale of the parcel supervisor is of Rs. 5500-9000. On enquiring about the nature of duties of B.P. Asthana the management witness stated in cross-examination that when posted at small stations, the Book Supervisors work as in-charge and when there is shortage of staff they have to distribute ticket also. It was further stated that workman had no power to issue charge sheet; but from the evidence of the management it is not established that the nature of duties performed by the workman were managerial or supervisory in nature.

Thus, from the evidence forwarded by the parties, it is not established that the nature of duties performed by the

claimant were of supervisory or managerial in nature and as such I come to the conclusion that the claimant B.P. Asthana was 'workman' as defined in Section 2 's' of the I.D. Act, 1947.

14. It is the case of the workman that he fell ill in three spells, totaling for 173 days and he requested the management for commutation of his sick leave into LHAP for which he was entitled under Rules; but the management failed to commute his sick leave into LHAP and consequently, at the time of his superannuation he was encashed leave for 181 days. Had the management had commuted said leave he might have encashed 300 days leave, thus, he is seeking a direction to the management to encash 119 days leave. In his evidence the workman has stated that he remained sick from 4-05-98 to 20-07-98 for 78 days and from 29-07-98 to 08-09-98 for 42 days and resumed his during at Northern Railway Station Rosa where he submitted an application dated 10-10-98 for commutation of sick leave. He further state that he again fell ill from 01-01-2000 to 12-02-2000 for 53 days and on fitness he submitted application for commutation of this sick leave and furthermore that he submitted reminders dated 02-02-2003 and 27-02-2003 for the same. He has also stated that as per directions contained in Railway Board's letter dated 08-03-88 his one kind of leave (sick leave) could have been converted into other type of leave (LHAP). In cross-examination, the workman stated that he moved application, paper No. 9/21 on 02-02-2003 and paper No. 9/22 on 27-02-2003. In rebuttal, the management witness stated that the workman was not on the sick list at Sandila and Rosa stations nor he moved any application for conversion of leave for the periods from 4-05-98 to 20-07-98 and from 29-07-98 to 08-09-98. In cross-examination the management witness stated that a workman can commute his leave, within a month, on making an application with fitness certificate of the doctor; and further he stated that it is necessary that application for commutation should be preferred within one month. He submitted documents in support of his statement before this Tribunal.

15. Having gone through the evidence on record and submissions of the rival parties, it comes out that the workman, B.P. Asthana fell ill for three span of time, during period May 1998 to February, 2000 and he undergone treatment at different Railway Hospitals and after recovery he requested the management for commutation of his sick leave into HALP, which was available to him under Rules vide Railway Board's letter No. F (E) III/87, LE/1/2 dated 08-03-88; but the workman failed to file admission and discharge slip or medical certificate to the effect to prove his contention that he had been admitted to Railway hospital at different spells and also undergone surgical operation. The typed copy of Railway Board's letter dated

08-03-88, relied on by the workman, paper No. 9/23 is on the record; the contents of said letter are given hereunder:

“यदि प्राधिकृत रेलवे डॉक्टर से सिक व फिट प्रमाण पत्र प्रस्तुत किये जाएं तो एक प्रकार की छुट्टी दूसरे प्रकार की छुट्टी में पिछले प्रभाव से सम्परिवारित की जा सकती है।”

On the contrary the management has relied on the paper No. M-14, report of Station Superintendent, Rosa Jn.; wherein it has been mentioned that the workman taken charge from Sandila Station to Rosa Station on the post of SM-II on 10-09-98 and as per official documents he was not in the sick list during his tenure up to 22-02-2000. Further, the management has contended that the workman made no request for commutation of leave before the authority designated in that behalf by the management, within a period of 30 days of his joining his duty on the expiry of the relevant spell of leave availed by the claimant, if any. It was also submitted that the claimant did not submit any sickness or fitness certificate as required under Rules; and the same had never been submitted to the appropriate and competent authority. It has relied on P.S. No. 11546, issued by the Railway Board, added in rule 505 of Indian Railway Establishment Code aft sub rule (1) w.e.f. 04-03-1998, which is as follows:

“Provided that no such request shall be considered unless received by such authority on any other authority designated in the behalf, within a period of 30 days of the concerned Railway Servant joining his duty on the expiry of the relevant spell of leave availed by him.”

There is no evidence from the workman that he has submitted the application(s) for commutation of leave within a period of 30 days on joining his duty on the expiry of the relevant spell of leave availed by him; along with sickness and fitness certificate to enable the management to consider his application for commuting his leave. Moreover, he was not on the sick list of the management during period 10-09-1988 to 22-02-2000.

16. Thus, it becomes apparent that as contended by the workman himself under Rules, vide letter dated 08-03-88 of the railway board, for commutation of one kind of leave into other, the workman was required to move application for the same duly supported by “Sick and Fitness Certificate”; but the workman failed to prove that he made an application with required certificates. A bare perusal of the applications for commutation dated 10-10-98, 02-02-2003 and 27-02-2003, relied on by the workman, are not supported by any sick and fitness certificate, therefore, not maintainable. Moreover, it is also not proved that the workman preferred those applications for commutation of his leave with stipulated time of thirty days before the Competent Authority.

17. Therefore, in view of the discussions made above, I am of the considered opinion that the action of the

management of railway in not commuting leave of the workman was neither unjustified nor illegal.

18. Accordingly, the reference is adjudicated against the workman's union; and as such, I come to the conclusion that the workman, B.P. Asthana is not entitled to any of the relief(s) claimed.

19. Award as above.

LUCKNOW. Dr. MANJU NIGAM, Presiding Officer  
28-08-2012

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ. 3139.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एस.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 66/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/316/2004-आई आर (सीएम-II)]

बी. एम. पटनायक, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3139.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 66/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of M/s. South Eastern coalfields Limited and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18-9-2012.

[No. L-22012/316/2004-IR (CM-II)]

B. M. PATNAIK, Section Officer

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR**

**No. CGIT/LC/R/66/2005**

**PRESIDING OFFICER: SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN**

The President,  
Koyla Shramik Sabha (UTUC),  
Old Colliery Guest House,  
Birsinghpur Pali,  
Umaria (MP)

... Workman

*Versus*

The Sub Area Manager,  
Pali Group, Johilla Area,  
South Eastern Coalfields Limited,  
PO Nowrozabad, Distt. Umaria,  
Umaria (MP)

... Management



**AWARD**

Passed on this 28th day of August, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-22012/316/2004/IR(CM-II) dated 14-7-2008 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“क्या उप क्षेत्रीय प्रबंधक, पाली समूह, जोहिला क्षेत्र, एस.ई.सी. एल. द्वारा श्री रामनारायण पाण्डेय, स्वीपर मेट, टोकन नं. 13974, पाली परियोजना को उनके मूल पद से उच्च पद स्वच्छता सुपरवाइजर का कार्य लेना एवं उक्त पद पर उनका नियमितकरण अथवा पदोन्नति न करना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष को पाने का अधिकारी है?”

2. The case of the Union/workman in short is that the workman Shri Ram Narayan Pandey was appointed as Mazdoor on 23-3-1984 in SECL and is presently on the post of Sweeper Mate Cat-II but he is working as Sanitary Supervisor from 1992 continuously. He passed "Parthama" Examination in second division from Sahitya Samelan, Paryag which is a recognised institution. He also got trade certificate from ITI Shahdol in 1973. It is stated that the post of sanitary supervisor is vacant since long but the management is not promoting him on the said post. It is submitted that the management be directed to promote the workman on the post of Sanitary Supervisor.

3. The management appeared and filed Written Statement to contest the reference. The case of the management, inter alia, is that the service conditions of the employees working in Coal India are governed by various settlement known as National Coal Wage Agreement (in short NCWA). Cadre scheme have been formulated for each category of employees. Admittedly the workman was initially appointed as General Mazdoor on 23-3-84. Consequently he was promoted to the post of Sweeper mat Cat-III w.e.f. 13-1-92 and he is working on the said post since then. The cadre Scheme applicable to the Safai Karamchari is given in Annexure XXVII-8 to the NCWA. Whereas the Cadre Scheme for Para Medical Staff/Sanitary Personnel is given in Annexure VI-6(A). It is stated that the workman had never worked as Sanitary Supervisor. The workman cannot change the cadre according to his own choice. Cadre scheme for Para Medical Staff is not applicable to the workman. It is submitted that there is no merit in the dispute of the Union.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are framed for adjudication—

I. Whether the action of the management in not promoting and regularizing on the post of Sanitary Supervisor after taking its working is legal and justified?

II. To what relief the workman is entitled?

5. **Issue No. I :** The workman Shri Narayan Pandey is examined in the case. He has stated that he was promoted to Sanitary Jamdar on 12-2-92 vide letter 234 dated 12-2-92. The Union has not filed the said letter to corroborate that he was promoted on the post of sanitary Jamedar. In absence of the document, his evidence is not reliable. Moreover there is no such pleading of the Union. He has stated in his cross- examination that he was appointed as General mazdoor. He has stated that he got written order to work as Sanitary Supervisor but no such order is filed by the Union. This fact shows that he had never worked as Sanitary Supervisor as has been pleaded by the management. He has further stated that presently he is Sanitary mate and is getting the pay of sanitary mate. He has further stated that he had never worked as Sanitary Supervisor. This shows that the claim of the Union that the workman was working as Sanitary Supervisor from 1992 is not substantiated.

6. On the other hand, the management has also examined one witness. The management witness Shri Tilak Kumar is presently working as Manager Personnel at Pali Sub Area, Johilla Area, SECL. He has stated that the workman was initially appointed as General Mazdoor on 23-3-84 and subsequently he was promoted to the post of sweeper mate Cat-III w.e.f. 13-1-92. The Cadre Scheme applicable to him is Safai Karamchari as given in Annexure XXVII-8 to the NCWA. He has stated that the cadre scheme for Para Medical Staff/ Sanitary Personnel is given in Annexure VI-6A. The management has filed both the cadre schemes which are annexure M/1 and M/2. His evidence clearly shows that the workman doesnot belong to the cadre scheme of which he is demanding to be promoted. This witness has further stated that the workman had not worked as Sanitary Supervisor at any time. This fact is also admitted by the workman in his evidence. Thus it is clear that the claim of the Union that the workman was continuously working as Sanitary Supervisor from 1992 is not established. This shows that the claim of the Union is not justified. This issue is decided against the Union/ workman and in favour of the management.

7. **Issue No. II :** On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the action of the management is justified and legal in not promoting to the workman as Sanitary Supervisor in the Cadre Scheme of Para Medical Staff/Sanitary Personnel. It is evident that the workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is accordingly answered.

8. In the result, the award is passed without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer



नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

## AWARD

14-8-2012

का.आ.3140.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जवाहर नवोदय विद्यालय के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंधा में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचाट (आईडी संख्या 6/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/83/2005-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी. एम. पटनायक, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3140.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 6/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, and their workman, received by the Central Government on 18-09-2012.

[No. L-42012/38/2005-IR(CM-II)]

B. M. PATNAIK, Section Officer

### ANNEXURE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM-LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Presiding Officer

Sh. N.K. Purohit

I.D. 6/2006

Reference No. L-42012/38/2005-IR(CM-II)  
dated : 6-12-2005

Shri Om Prakash

S/o Mangi Lal

Through Joint Secretary, H.M.S.

Bangali Colony, Chhawani Kota,

Rajasthan.

V/s

The Principal

Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya

Atru, Distt. Baran,

Rajasthan- 325218.

#### Present:

For the applicant Union: Sh. Kapil Sharma

For the Non-applicant: Sh. V. S. Gurjar

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause (d) of sub-section 1 & 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following Industrial dispute to this tribunal for adjudication:—

"Whether the action of the Principal, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Atru, Dist. Baran- 325218 (Raj.) in terminating the services of Sh. Om Prakash S/o Sh. Mangli Lal w.e.f. 29-5-04 is legal & justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The workman in his claim statement has pleaded that he was engaged by the non-applicant as daily wager class IV employee on 30-8-95. The workman has further pleaded that while he was at his village during summer vacation, he was intimated by a registered letter dated 29-5-04 that his services had been terminated w.e.f. 29-5-04 and a cheque of Rs. 9660 was being enclosed. But no such cheque was found enclosed with the said letter. The workman has also pleaded that he had worked under the employment of the non-applicant during period 30-8-95 to 29-5-04 and, had worked for more than 240 days during said period in spite of this his services have been terminated without any notice and compensation in lieu of notice, therefore, his termination is in violation of section 25-F of the I.D. Act. It has been alleged that no seniority list was prepared and while terminating his services the persons junior to him have been retained. Thus, his termination is also in violation of the Section 25-G of the I.D. Act.

3. In reply, the management has averred that the workman was not engaged on 30-8-95 as daily wager class IV employee. No post of class IV was lying vacant at that time. It has been averred that a cheque of Rs. 9660 along with the retrenchment order was sent to the workman but when he informed that he did not receive the cheque, another cheque bearing no. 570384 dated 26-8-04 of Rs. 9660 was given to him vide letter no. 1588-89 dated 28-8-04 before the RLC (Kota) and receipt of the same was obtained on 27-8-04 on the letter dated 26-8-04. Thus, the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act has been strictly complied with. It has been denied that termination of the workman was in violation of section 25-G of the I.D. Act.

4. The management has also contended that non-applicant is not an 'industry' therefore; the claim of the workman is not maintainable.

5. In evidence, the workman has filed his affidavit whereas the non-applicant has filed counter affidavit of Shri Pepsingh Rajawat, Principal, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Atru.

6. The workman has filed documents Ex.W-1 to W-3 and the non-applicant has filed documents Ex. M-1 to Ex-M-3 in support of their respective case.

7. Heard the learned representatives on behalf of both the parties and perused the relevant record.

8. In view of the pleadings of both the sides the following questions crop-up for consideration:—

- (i) Whether at the time of terminating services of the workman w.e.f. 29-5-04, the provisions of Section 25-F has been complied with?
- (ii) Whether at the time of terminating services of the workman juniors to him were retained in the job in violation of Section 25-G of the I.D. Act?
- (iii) Whether non-applicant management is an “industry”?
- (iv) To what relief the workman is entitled to?

#### Point No.1

9. The learned -representative for the workman contends that the workman did not receive notice pay and compensation at the time of his termination on 29-5-04. The reason assigned for the termination is also not correct.

10. Per contra, learned representative for the management submits that from the documents Ex. M-1 to Ex-M-3 and oral evidence of the management witness, it has been established that notice pay & compensation required to be paid u/s 25-F of the I.D.Act have been received by the workman.

11. The workman has deposed that he had worked under the employment of the non-applicant during period 30-8-95 to 29-5-04 and, had worked for more than 240 days. It is an admitted case of the non-applicant that in compliance of the Section 25-F notice pay & amount of Rs.9660 was paid to the workman. Thus, it has been impliedly admitted by the management that the workman had worked continuously for one year as envisage u/s 25-F of the I.D.Act.

12. The workman has admitted in his statement that he had received letter no. JNP-AIRU/2004-05/867 dated 29-5-04 at his village by registered post but he has stated that he did not receive the cheque of Rs.9660 said to be enclosed with the said letter.

13. The management has produced the copy of the termination order dated 29-5-04 (Ex. M-1) and letters addressed to the workman dated 7-8-04(Ex. M-2) and 26-8-04(Ex.M-3). As per statement of the management witness a cheque of Rs. 9660 was sent to the workman along with order dated 29-5-04(Ex. M-1). The relevant para of the impugned order dated 29-5-04 (Ex. M-1) is reproduced below :—

“Since Mr. Om Prakash S/o Sh. Mangi Lal Berwan, was engaged purely on temporary and daily wage

basis in view of availability of temporary nature of work in the Navodaya Vidyalaya Atru District Baran. The temporary nature work is no more available and his services are no more required now and are hereby terminated with effect from 29-5-04. he is entitled to compensation and one month's pay in lieu of notice hence, an amount of Rs.8100 (Rs. Eight Thousand One Hundred only) on account of compensation and a sum of Rs.1560 (One Thousand Five Hundred Sixty only) being one month's pay in lieu of notice, total Rs.9660 (Rs.Nine Thousand Six Hundred Sixty only) is being paid to him with this office order by enclosed cheque bearing No.641579 dated 29-5-04 drawn on bank of S.B.B.J. branch Atru.

He is relieved of his duty on 29-5-2004 in the A/N.”

14. Upon perusal of the retrenchment order dated 29-5-04 (Ex. M-1), letter dated 7-8-04(Ex. M-2) and 26-8-04 (Ex. M-3), it reveals that impugned order dated 29-5-04 (Ex. M-1) was sent by registered post & a cheque bearing no. 641579 dated 29-5-04 drawn on Bank of SBBJ branch, Atru was shown as its encloser. It further reveals that when the workman vide his letter dated 14-6-04 informed that he did not receive the said cheque along with the order dated 29-5-04, he was asked to collect the cheque from the vidyalaya on any working days vide letter dated 7-8-04 (Ex. M-2). Thereafter, another cheque bearing no. 570384 dated 26-8-04 of Rs. 9660 was given to the workman before RLC (C), Kota on 27-8-04 vide letter dated 26.8.04(Ex. M-3).

15. Thus, it is evident from the said documents that the retrenchment order as well as the cheque of Rs.9660 were not given to the workman on the date of termination i.e. 29-5-04. Admittedly, the payment of the notice pay and compensation have been made to the workman on 27-8-04 by cheque dated 26-8-04. Thus, the amount of notice pay and compensation was paid to the workman after the date of termination i.e. 29-5-04. Apart that the retrenchment order was not served upon the workman on 29-5-04.

16. It is well settled that retrenchment compensation is to be paid to the workman before he is asked to go. Section 25-F postulates two mandatory conditions to be fulfilled by an employer for effecting a valid retrenchment namely : (i) one months notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment or wages in lieu of such notice; (ii) Payment of compensation equivalent to 15 day's average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months. It is also well settled that the Section imposes a mandatory duty on the employer which is a condition precedent to valid retrenchment of a workman and contravention of the mandatory requirements of the Section would invalidate the retrenchment and render it void as intitio. A condition precedent is required to be fulfilled before the effect of the retrenchment order can follow.

17. In present case, the termination order as well as cheque of compensation were not actually tendered to the workman on the date of termination i.e. 29-5-04. Sending termination order along with cheque of retrenchment compensation and notice pay was not a genuine offer on the date of termination. It is evident from the documents of the management itself that amount of retrenchment compensation and notice pay by cheque was not paid simultaneously on the date of retrenchment. The workman was relieved on 29-5-04 whereas the retrenchment order was served upon him later on and the cheque was delivered to the workman on 27-8-04 after a period of about three months.

18. For the above reasons, the payment or tender of compensation and notice pay to the workman after retrenchment has taken effect on 29-5-04 has vitiated the retrenchment and non-compliance with the mandatory provisions has nullified the retrenchment.

19. In view of above discussions, it is concluded that vide terminating the services of the workman clause (a) and (b) of 25-F of the I.D. Act have not been complied with strictly, therefore, this point is decided in favour of the workman.

#### **Point No. II**

20. The workman in his statement has deposed that at the time of terminating his services juniors to him namely Bharosibai, Bhuribai, Mahavir Meena, Ramsingh, Girraj etc. were in the job. In cross-examination he was unable to say whether the above persons were in the job or not and what job they were performing. He has not produced any documents in this regard. He has further stated that when he was in the job the above persons were doing work but they were removed from service in the year 2003. Thus, it is evident from the statement of the workman himself that at the time of his termination on 29-5-04, the above named persons were not in the job. Therefore, workman has failed to establish that his termination was in violation of provisions of Section 25-G of the I.D. Act. This point is decided against the workman and in favour of the non-applicant.

#### **Point No. III**

21. The learned representative for the non-applicant school contends that the JNV does not fall within the definition of section 2(J) of the Act and the vidyalay being an educational institute, it is not commercial establishment. Controverting it, the learned representative on behalf of the workman submits that as per legal proposition laid down in Bangalore Water Supply case, the vidyalay is also an 'industry' within the meaning of 2(J) of the Act. In Bangalore Water Supply case reported in 1978 LLJ 349 (SC) the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed and concluded that an educational institution is an industry in accordance with the parameters laid down by the Court. The relevant observation is usefully quoted as below :—

“The final ground accepted by the Court is that education is a mission and vocation, rather than a profession or trade or business. The most that one can say is that this is an assertion which does not prove itself. Indeed, all life is a mission and a man without a mission is spiritually still-born. The high mission of life is the manifestation of the divinity already in man. To christen education as a mission even if true is not to negate its being an industry. We have to look at educational activity from the angle of the Act, and so viewed the ingredients of education are fulfilled. Education is, therefore, an industry and nothing can stand in the way of that conclusion.”

22. The observation made by the Hon'ble Apex lends support submission advanced on behalf of the workman and it is held that the non-applicant institution is an 'industry' as defined under Section 2-J of the Act. This point, therefore, is decided in favour of the workman.

#### **Point No. IV**

23. On account of the decision of Point no. I and III in favour of the workman, it is concluded that the action of the non-applicant in terminating the services of the workman from 29-5-04 is not justified and legal.

24. This legal position is not in dispute that in case of non-compliance of Section 25-F the workman can be reinstated with other consequential reliefs.

25. Earlier in cases of termination in violation of Section 25-F reinstatement of the workman with full back wages used to be automatically granted, but keeping in view several other factors, a change in the said trend is now found in the recent decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In a large number of decisions in the matter of grant of relief of the kind, Hon'ble Apex Court has distinguished between a daily wager who does not hold a post and a permanent employee.

26. In decision reported in (2010) 1 SCC (L & S) 545 Jagbir Singh V/s Haryana State Agriculture Mktg. Board after considering the earlier decisions referred to therein on the point should an order of reinstatement automatically follows in a case of violation of Section 25-F' of the I.D. Act Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that :—

“It would be, thus seen that by a catena of decisions in recent time, this Court has clearly laid down that an order of retrenchment passed in violation of Section 25-F although may be set aside but an award of reinstatement should not, however, be automatically passed. The award of reinstatement with full back wages in a case where the workman has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of termination, particularly, daily wagers has not been found to be proper by this Court and

instead compensation has been awarded. This court has distinguished between a daily wager who does not hold a post and a permanent employee.”

27. Continuing this line of approach in decision (2010) 2 SCC (L & S) 376 Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:—

“While the earlier view of the Court was that if an order of termination was found to be illegal, normally the relief to be granted would be reinstatement with full back wages. However, with the passage of time it came to be realized that an industry should not be compelled to pay to the workman for the period during which he apparently contributed little or nothing at all. The relief to be granted is discretionary and not automatic. A person is not entitled to get something only because it would be lawful to do so. The changes brought out by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Government in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalization, privatization and outsourcing was evident. Hence now there is no such principle that for an illegal termination of service the normal rule is reinstatement with back wages, and instead the Labour Court can award compensation.”

“There has been a shift in the legal position laid down by the Supreme Court and now there is no hard-and-fast principle that on the termination of service being found to be illegal reinstatement with back wages is to be awarded. Compensation can be awarded instead, at the discretion of the Labour Court, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case.”

28. In present matter, the workman was working as daily wager. He was not holding any regular post. Keeping in view the nature of job, nature and duration of employment, amount already paid as retrenchment compensation, the laps of time after termination of the services and having regard the entire facts and circumstances of the case, instead of reinstating him the interest of justice will be sub served by paying Rs.35000 as compensation to the workman instead and in lieu of relief of reinstatement in service.

29. Accordingly, the reference is answered in affirmative in favour of the workman and, it is held that the action of the management in termination of the services of the workman being in violation of clauses (a) and (b) of the Section 25-F of the Act is illegal and unjustified. Therefore, the non-applicant is directed to pay compensation to the workman worth Rs. 35000 (Thirty Five Thousand Only) instead and in lieu of his reinstatement of service. The payment shall be made within eight weeks from the

publication of the award failing which it shall carry interest @ 9% per annum.

30. Award as above.

N.K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3141.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार जवाहर नवोदय विद्यालय के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, श्रम न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचाट (आईडी संख्या 9/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/37/2005-आईआर (सीएम-II)]

बी. एम. पटनायक, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3141.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 9/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18-09-2012.

[No. L-42012/37/2005-IR(CM-II)]

B. M. PATNAIK, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM-LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

Shri N.K.Purohit, Presiding Officer

**I.D. 9/2006**

Reference No. L-420 12/37/2005-IR(CM-II) dated : 21-12-2005

Shri Ram Karan Meena S/o Shanker Lal

Through Joint Secretary, H.M.S.,

Bangali Colony, Kota (Raj.)

V/s

The Principal Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Atru,  
Distt. Baran, Rajasthan- 325218.

#### Present:

For the applicant Union : Sh. Kapil Sharma

For the Non-applicant : Sh. V.S. Gurjar



**AWARD**

14-8-2012

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause (d) of Sub-section 1 and 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following Industrial dispute to this tribunal for adjudication:—

“Whether the action of the Principal, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Atru, Dist. Baran- 325218 (Raj.) in terminating the services of Sh. Ram Karan Meena S/o Sh. Shankar Lal w.e.f. 29-5-2004 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The workman in his claim statement has pleaded that he was engaged by the non-applicant as daily wager class IV employee on 2-8-96. His services were terminated by the non-applicant on 18-10-99 without assigning any reason. The industrial dispute in this regard pending before the Industrial Tribunal (Central), Kota was disposed of on the basis of settlement dated 20-11-02 and he was reinstated by the non-applicant. Thereafter, the non-applicant again terminated his services vide order dated 29-5-04 without assigning any reason. While he was at his village during summer vacation, the said letter terminating his services w.e.f. 29-5-04 was received by him on 1-6-04. The workman has contended that he has been paid Rs.1560 as notice pay for 26 days only, whereas as per law Rs.1 800 as notice pay should have been paid to him for 30 days. Since, he has been paid lesser amount of notice pay, his retrenchment is illegal. He has further contended that no seniority list was prepared and at the time of terminating his services junior persons to him namely Bharosibai, Bhuribai, Mahaveer Meena, Ramsingh and Girraj were in the job. Thus, his retrenchment is in violation of Section 25-F and G of the I.D.Act. The workman has prayed to reinstate him with back wages and all consequential benefits.

3. In reply, the non-applicant has raised preliminary objection regarding maintainability of the claim on the ground that non-applicant is not an ‘industry’ within the meaning of Section 2(J) of the I.D. Act. The non-applicant has denied that the workman was employed on 2-8-96 as daily wager class IV servant. The non-applicant has averred that workman was employed as daily wager for performing only casual work. It has been denied that services of the workman were earlier terminated on 18-10-99. The non-applicant has also averred that while terminating the services of the workman vide order dated 29-5-04, amount of notice pay and compensation had been paid to him as per provisions of the Section 25-F of the I.D. Act.

4. The non-applicant has further averred that the persons said to be juniors and retained by the non-applicant were not in the employment of the non-applicant. The non-applicant has further averred that there were only two permanent posts of helper and casual work of the mess

was being performed through contractor as per requirement. The workman has not acquired any legal right to remain in the employment merely on the ground of 8 years service as daily wager.

5. In evidence, the workman has filed his affidavit whereas the non-applicant has filed counter affidavit of Shri Pepsingh Rajawat, Principal, Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Atru.

6. The workman has filed documents Ex-w-1 to w-14 in support of his case. The non-applicant has not filed any document.

7. In view of the pleadings of both the sides the following questions crop-up for consideration :—

- (i) Whether at the time of terminating services of the workman w.e.f. 29-5-04, the provisions of Section 25-F has been complied with?
- (ii) Whether at the time of terminating services of the workman juniors to him were retained in the job in violation of Section 25-G of the I.D. Act?
- (iii) Whether the non-applicant management is an ‘industry’?
- (iv) To what relief the workman is entitled to?

**Point No.1**

8. Admittedly, the services of the workman were retrenched vide impugned order dated 29-5-04 (Ex-w-2). The workman has stated that while he was at his village during summer vacation, the said order was received by registered post on 1-6-04. The workman has further stated that Rs.1560 as notice pay have been paid for 26 days only whereas as per law Rs. 1800 as notice pay for 30 days were to be paid to him. In cross-examination he has stated that he was not getting salary for Sunday.

9. The management witness Shri Pepsingh Rajawat has stated that amount of one months notice pay and compensation has been paid to the workman as per provisions of Section 25-F or the I.D. Act. He has further stated that amount of notice pay and compensation was paid on the basis of 15 days average pay for the period during which he was in continuous service. In cross examination he has stated that record pertaining to one months notice pay and compensation was available with the non-applicant.

10. The learned representative for the workman contends that notice pay has not been paid as per provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act and mandatory provisions of Section 25-F have not been complied with. Per contra, the learned representative for the non-applicant submits that notice pay as well as compensation have been paid as per clause (a) and (b) of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act.

11. I have given my thoughtful consideration on the above submissions.

12. The services of the workman were terminated by the Office Order dated 29-5-04 (W-2). The relevant para of the said order is reproduced below :—

“Since Mr. Ram Karan Meena S/o Sh. Shankar Lal Meena was engaged purely on temporary and daily wage basis in view of availability of temporary nature of work in the Navodaya Vidyalaya Atru District Baran. The temporary nature work is no more available and his services are no more required now and are hereby terminated with effect from 29-5-2004. He is entitled to compensation and one month's pay in lieu of notice hence, an amount of Rs. 7200 (Rs. Seven Thousand Two Hundred only) on account of compensation and a sum of Rs. 1560 (One Thousand five Hundred sixty only) being one month's pay in lieu of notice, total Rs.8760 (Rs. Eight Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty only) is being paid to him with this office order by enclosed cheque bearing no. 641580 dated 29-05-04 drawn on bank of SBBJ branch Atru.

He is relieved of his duty on 29-05-2004 in the A/N.”

13. It is well settled that for a retrenchment to be valid, it is incumbent upon the employer to fulfill the requirements of clause (a) and, (b) of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, Clauses (a) and (b) of Section 25-F prescribe the imperative conditions for retrenching a workman. Section 25 envisage's that no workman employed in any industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year shall be retrenched by the employer until (a) the workman has been given one months notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for period of the notice; (b) the workman has been paid at the time of retrenchment compensation which shall be equivalent to 15 days average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months.

14. Section 2(aaa) of the I.D. Act lays down the manner to calculate the average pay of monthly, weekly or daily rated workman. Section 2(aaa) says that average pay means the average of the wages payable to a workman in the case of monthly paid workman in three completed calendar months, in the case of weekly paid workman in four completed weeks, in the case of daily paid workman in 12 full working days preceding the date on which the average pay becomes payable if the workman had worked for three complete calendar months or four complete weeks or 12 full working days as the case may be and, where such calculations cannot be made the average pay shall be calculated as the average of wages payable to a workman during the period he actually worked.

15. The average pay has to be determined in accordance with the aforesaid provision. In the case of a workman who is being paid wages on monthly basis, his average pay has to be calculated in accordance with the formula given in

clause (i) of Section 2(aaa) of the Act which would mean taking the sum total of wages paid to him in three complete calendar months immediately preceding his retrenchment and dividing the said amount by three. The principle of 26 working days for determining the compensation payable in terms of Section 25-F(b) of the Act in such matter is not relevant.

16. In the present matter, the non-applicant has paid Rs. 1560 as notice pay and Rs.7200 as compensation. Average pay for 15 day's after taking the sum total of wages paid to him in three complete calendar months immediately preceding his retrenchment and dividing the said amount by three comes to Rs. 1800 and it has been admitted by the non-applicant that the workman had worked for 8 years. As per clause (b) of Section 25-F the retrenchment compensation was to be paid equivalent to 15 day's average pay for every completed year of continuous service.

The retrenchment compensation for 8 years of completed service multiplied by 15 day's average pay i.e. Rs. 900 would be Rs.7200. It is not the case of the workman that said amount has not been calculated correctly. The dispute is regarding amount of notice pay.

17. The workman has been paid Rs.1560 as notice pay. The workman has stated that Rs.1800 should have been paid as notice pay. It is evident from the amount of retrenchment compensation paid to the workman that monthly salary at the time of terminating his services was Rs. 1800. The management witness has not denied this fact that workman was getting Rs.1800 as monthly salary.

18. An employee never works and could never be permitted to work for all the 30 days of the month. He gets 52 Sundays in a year as paid holiday and, therefore, a worker gets full months wages not by remaining on duty for all the 30 days within a month but by remaining on work and doing duties for only 26 days. In present case, the workman's monthly salary was Rs.1800 but it is evident from the amount of notice pay i.e. Rs. 560 that the notice pay has been paid for 26 days only. Thus, the workman has been paid lesser amount or notice pay under clause (a) of the Section 25-F of the I.D. Act.

19. Apart that, upon perusal of the impugned retrenchment order dated 29-5-04, it is evident that the services of the workman were terminated on 29-5-04 and he was relieved on the said date. The retrenchment order as well as the cheque was not given to the workman on the date of his termination i.e. 29-5-04. The workman has stated that the impugned retrenchment order was received by him through registered post on 1-6-04. The management witness has not denied this fact. Thus, the amount of notice pay and compensation was paid to the workman after the date of termination on 29-5-04 and retrenchment order was also served after terminating services on the said date.

20. It is well settled that retrenchment compensation is to be paid to the workman before he is asked to go. Section

25-F postulates two mandatory conditions to be fulfilled by an employer for effecting a valid retrenchment namely (i) one months notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment or wages in lieu of such notice; (ii) Payment of compensation equivalent to 15 day's average pay for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months. It is also well settled that the section imposes a mandatory duty on the employer which is a condition precedent to valid retrenchment of a workman and contravention of the mandatory requirements of the section would invalidate the retrenchment and render it void as intio. A condition precedent is required to be fulfilled before the effect of the retrenchment order can follow.

21. In present ease, the termination order as well as cheque of compensation were not actually tendered to the workman on the date of termination i.e. 29-5-04. Sending termination order along with cheque of retrenchment compensation and notice pay was not a genuine offer on the date of termination. It is evident from the documents of the management itself that amount of retrenchment compensation and notice pay by cheque was not paid simultaneously on the date of retrenchment. The workman was relieved on 29-5-04 whereas the retrenchment order was served upon him on 27-8-04.

22. For the above reasons, the payment or tender of compensation and, notice pay to the workman after retrenchment has taken effect on 29-5-04 has vitiated the retrenchment and non-compliance with the mandatory provisions has nullified the retrenchment.

23. In view of above discussions, it is concluded that vide terminating the services of the workman clause (a) and (b) of 25-F of the I.D. Act have not been complied with strictly, therefore, this point is decided in favour of the workman.

#### **Point No. II**

24. The workman in his statement has deposed that at the time of terminating services juniors to him namely Bharosibai, Bhuribai, Mahavir Meena, Ramsingh, Girraj etc. were in the job. The management witness Sh. Pepsing has stated that the above named persons were not employee of the non-applicant.

25. The workman in his cross-examination has stated that above named persons were used to be employed in case of absence of other employees. He has not produced any record in respect of aforementioned workers. Except his bald statement in this regard there is no other material on record to substantiate his statement that the above named persons were junior to him and at the time of his termination they were in the job.

26. Thus, the workman has failed to established that his termination was in violation of 25-G of the I.D. Act. This point is decided against the workman and in favour of the non-applicant.

#### **Point No. III**

27. The learned representative for the non-applicant school contends that the JNV does not fall within the definition of Section 2(J) of the Act and the vidyalay being an educational institute, it is not commercial establishment. Controverting it, the learned representative on behalf of the workman submits that as per legal proposition laid down in Bangalore Water Supply case, the vidyalay is also an 'industry' within the meaning of 2(J) of the Act. In Bangalore Water Supply case reported in 1978 LLJ 349 (SC) the Hon'ble Apex court has observed and concluded that an educational institution is an industry in accordance with the parameters laid down by the Court. The observation is usefully quoted as below:—

“The final ground accepted by the Court is that education is a mission and vocation, rather than a profession or trade or business. The most that one can say is that this is an assertion which does not prove itself. Indeed, all life is a mission and a man without a mission is spiritually still-born. The high mission of life is the manifestation of the divinity already in man. To christen education as a mission even if true is not to negate its being an industry. We have to look at educational activity from the angle of the Act, and so viewed the ingredients of education are fulfilled. Education is, therefore, an industry and nothing can stand in the way of that conclusion.”

28. The observation made by the Hon'ble Apex Lends support to the submission advanced on behalf of the workman and it is held that the non-applicant institution is an 'industry' as defined under Section 2-J of the Act.. This point, thererore, is decided in favour of the workman.

#### **Point No. IV**

29. On account or the decision of Point no. I & III in favour of the workman, it is concluded that the action of the non-applicant in terminating the services of the workman from 1-9-05 is not justified and, legal.

30. This legal position is not in dispute that in case of non compliance of Section 25-F the workman can be reinstated with other consequential reliefs.

31. Earlier in cases of termination in violation of Section 25-F reinstatement of the workman with full back wages used to be automatically granted, but keeping in view several other factors, a change in the said trend is now found in the recent decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In a large number of decisions in the matter of grant of relief of the kind, Hon'ble Apex Court has distinguished between a daily wager who does not hold a post and a permanent employee.



32. In decision reported in (2010) 1 SCC (L and S) 545 Jagbir Singh V/s Haryana State Agriculture Mktg. Board after considering the earlier decisions referred to therein on the point should an order of reinstatement automatically follows in a case of violation of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act Hon'ble Apex Court has observed that:—

“It would be, thus seen that by a catena of decisions in recent time, this Court has clearly laid down that an order of retrenchment passed in violation of Section 25-F although may be set aside but an award of reinstatement should not, however, be automatically passed. The award of reinstatement with full back wages in a case where the workman has completed 240 days of work in a year preceding the date of termination, particularly, daily wagers has not been found to be proper by this Court and instead compensation has been awarded. This court has distinguished between a daily wager who does not hold a post and a permanent employee.”

33. Continuing this line of approach in decision (2010) 2 SCC (L and S) 376 Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:—

“While the earlier view of the Court was that if an order of termination was found to be illegal, normally the relief to be granted would be reinstatement with full back wages. However, with the passage of time it came to be realized that an industry should not be compelled to pay to the workman for the period during which he apparently contributed little or nothing at all. The relief to be granted is discretionary and not automatic. A person is not entitled to get something only because it would be lawful to do so. The changes brought out by the subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court probably having regard to the changes in the policy decisions of the Government in the wake of prevailing market economy, globalization, privatization and outsourcing was evident. Hence now there is no such principle that for an illegal termination of service the normal rule is reinstatement with back wages, and instead the Labour Court can award compensation.”

“There has been a shift in the legal position laid down by the Supreme Court and now there is no hard- and-fast principle that on the termination of service being found to be illegal reinstatement with back wages is to be awarded. Compensation can be awarded instead, at the discretion of the Labour Court, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case.”

34. In present matter, the workman was not holding any regular post. Keeping in view the nature of job, nature and duration of employment, amount already paid as retrenchment compensation, the laps of time after termination of the services and having regard the entire facts and circumstances of the case, instead of reinstating

him the interest of justice will be sub served by paying Rs.35000 as compensation to the workman instead and in lieu of relief of reinstatement in service.

35. Accordingly, the reference is answered in affirmative in favour of the workman and it is held that the action of the management in termination of the services of the workman being in violation of clauses (a) and (b) of the Section 25-F of the Act. is illegal and unjustified. Therefor the non-applicant is directed to pay compensation to the workman worth Rs.35000 (Thirty Five Thousand Only) instead and in lieu of his reinstatement of service. The payment shall be made within eight weeks from the publication of the award failing which it shall carry interest @ 9% per annum.

36. Award as above.

N. K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3142.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंध तंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 84/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/77/2004-आई आर (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

S.O. 3142.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 84/04) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of India, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18-09-2012

[No. L-12012/77/2004-IR(B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

No. CGIT/LC/R/84/04

Presiding Officer : SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN

The General Secretary,  
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,  
9, Sanwer Road, Ujjain

... Workman

#### Versus

The Deputy General Manager,  
State Bank of India,  
Zonal Office, Hamidia Road,  
Bhopal (MP)

... Management



**AWARD**

Passed on this 5th day of September 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/77/2004-IR(B-I) dated 7-7-2004 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of Dy. General Manager, State Bank of India, Bhopal in terminating the services of Shri Bhupendra Pal w.e.f. 16-2-95 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. The case of the Union/workman in short is that the Union is a registered Trade Union and the workman was member of the Union. The workman was engaged on casual basis in April 1990. Again he was engaged as casual labour on 2-12-1994 to 16-2-1995. It is stated that a settlement was arrived between the management and the Bank Union to give a chance for permanent appointment to those casual labour who had worked in between from 1-7-1975 to 14-8-91 for atleast 30 days. It is stated that the workman was called for interview but he was not taken in the bank service and the juniors to him were taken in Bank. It is stated that he was terminated on 16-2-1995 without giving any notice or without payment of any compensation in violation of the provision of Section 25-F of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. It is stated that the principle of 'last come first go' was also not followed. It is submitted that the workman be reinstated with back wages.

3. The management appeared and filed Written Statement. The case of the management, inter alia, is that the workman Shri Bhupendra Pal was engaged on daily wages at Ujjain Branch of the State Bank of India (in short SBI). He worked from April 1990 to October 1990 for 134 days and from 2-12-1994 to 15-2-95 for 53 days in a calendar year. His contract of work started with opening of the day and ended with closing of the Branch. His engagement was on need based looking to the exigency. It is admitted that an agreement was arrived on 17-11-1987 which was later on extended to 31-12-1991 between the management of SBI and SBI Staff Federation to give a chance for regular appointment on the conditions settled in the said agreement. It is stated that during the first span of engagement from April, 90 to October, 1990, the workman was below 18 years of age. The condition of age was not fulfilled by the workman and he was not taken for considering for permanent appointment in the bank. It is stated that there is no violation of the provisions of the Act, 1947. It is submitted that the reference be answered in favour of the management.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are settled—

- I. whether the action of the management in terminating the services of Shri Bhupendar Pal w.e.f. 16-2-95 is legal and justified?

II. To what relief the workman is entitled?

**5. Issue No. I**

The workman Shri Bhupender Pal is examined in the case. He has stated that his date of birth is 15-10-1973. This itself shows that he was below 18 days in October 1990. He has stated that the Manager had told him that till October 1990 he worked for 134 days and more. He has further stated that from 2-12-1994 to 15-2-1995 he worked only for 53 days. This itself shows that he had not completed 240 days in twelve calendar months preceding the date of termination on 16-2-1995. This shows that his case is not attracted under Section 25 B(2) of the Act, 1947 and therefore there is no violation of the provision of Section 25-F of the Act.

6. The workman has stated in his evidence that on the basis of working days, done in the bank, he was called for interview on 13-2-1997 vide Exhibit W/3 but he was not appointed and those who had less working days were appointed in the bank. He has stated in cross-examination that Paper No. 3/9, which is marked as Exhibit W/1, is the notice on the basis of which he had applied for appointment. Exhibit W/1 is admitted by the management. This is the notice published calling an application for given a chance to the casual labour for permanent appointment in the bank services on the basis of settlement between the management Bank and the SBI Union. There are certain conditions laid down in the notice to be fulfilled before considering his candidature for appointment. The age criteria was also one of them. Para-2 of the said notice (Exhibit W/1) runs as follows—

अगर उम्मीदवार अपनी प्रारम्भिक अस्थायी नियुक्ति के समय आवश्यक था लेकिन अस्थायी सेवा के दौरान वयस्क हो गया था तो उसे आयुसीमा के लिये रखे गए मापदण्ड के भीतर माना जाएगा और स्थायी नियुक्ति हेतु विचार किए जाने का अवसर दिया जाएगा। परन्तु ऐसे उम्मीदवारों द्वारा वयस्क हो जाने के बाद की ही अस्थाई सेवा की अवधि को मान्यता दी जाएगी।

This clearly shows that the period which is to be considered, he must be major. The workman has admitted in his evidence that his date of birth is 15-10-73. This clearly shows that in 1990 he was minor when he was disengaged. Thereafter he was engaged only in 1994-1995 for 53 days. Thus it is clear that the workman was not fit on the basis of settlement arrived between the management and the Union as the period of work done for considering his employment was in minority. This shows that the management has rightly not considered his candidature.

7. The workman has also filed other documents in the case which are admitted by the management. Exhibit W2 is the photocopy of certificate of experience. This is filed to show that he worked as daily wagger from 2-12-94 to 15-2-95 for 53 days. This fact is not disputed by the management. Exhibit W/3 is the interview letter. This is filed to show that

the workman was called for permanent appointment but he was not selected. The relevancy has already been discussed earlier. Exhibit W/4 to W/9 are the letters of the management to different workers of the Bank whereby the management paid compensation to those workers but no notice or compensation was paid to this workman. It is clear from the above discussion that the case of the workman is not attracted under Section 25 B(2) of the Act, 1947 and therefore Section 25-F of the Act, 1947 is not applicable in the case. This shows that he was not entitled to any compensation in accordance with the Act, 1947. Exhibit W/10 to W/12 are the appointment letters of different workers. It is filed to show that they were appointed as part time workers but he was terminated. The workman has not pleaded that these workers were also minor at the relevant period when they were considered for their appointment in accordance with the settlement. In absence of such plea and proof it cannot be deduced that they are not eligible for appointment. Thus oral and documentary evidence of the workman do not prove his case.

8. On the other hand, management has also adduced evidence in the case. The management witness Smt. Rita Shukla is Chief Manager (Adm.), Zonal office, Ujjain. She has supported this fact in his evidence that the workman Shri Bhupendra Pal was engaged on daily wages from April 1990 to October 1990 for 134 days and from 2-12-1994 to 15-2-1995 for 53 days. There is no challenge in the cross-examination. This fact clearly shows that the provision of Section 25 B (2) of the Act, 1947 is not applicable to consider his service continuous for a period of one year and therefore there is no violation of Section 25-F of the Act, 1947. He has admitted that his candidature was considered for permanent appointment in view of the settlement but he was found minor at the time of relevant period when the said workman was considered for appointment and therefore he was not selected for permanent service in terms of settlement. His evidence clearly shows that the action of the management was legal and justified in terminating him from service and not selecting him for permanent appointment. This issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

## 9. Issue No. II

On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the claim of the workman is not justified and he is not entitled to any relief. The reference is, accordingly, answered.

10. In the result, the award is passed without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3143.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ राजस्थान लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, श्रम न्यायालय जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 8/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/290/2003-आई.आर. (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3143.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. 8/04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of Bank of Rajasthan Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/290/2003-IR (B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

**NO. CGIT/LC/R/8/04**

**PRESIDING OFFICER : SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN**

The General Secretary,

Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,

9, Sanwer Road, Ujjain (MP)

Workman

## Versus

The Managing Director,

Bank of Rajasthan Ltd.,

G-3, Sardar Patel Marg, Jaipur (Rajasthan)

Management

## AWARD

Passed on this 3rd day of September, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/290/2003-IR (B-1) dated 6-2-2004 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of the Managing Director, Bank of Rajasthan Ltd. in not regularizing the services of Shri Kamlesh Bhartiya is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. The case of the Union/workman in short is that the workman Shri Kamlesh Bharti was engaged on daily wages @ Rs. 40 per day against a vacant post of peon-cum-Faras from 6-6-2001 at Ujjain Branch of the management Bank. It is stated that he was paid wages in the names of permanent peon Shri Pankaj and Ashok in five days in sequence. It is stated that he worked 240 days in a year then he raised dispute before Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central) Bhopal for regular appointed and for payment of bonus. Therefore he was terminated on 30-9-2002 without notice and without payment of compensation and engaged Shri Arun Shukla in his place. It is stated that he was terminated in violation of Section 25-F, G and N of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (in short the Act, 1947). It is submitted that the workman be reinstated and thereafter be regularized with back wages.

3. The management appeared and filed Written Statement. The case of the management in short is that the alleged workman was not appointed on any post of peon in the management Bank or its branches. Hence the question of regularization doesnot arise. It is further stated that the alleged workman had never worked in the Bank for 240 days or more as claimed by him. The Branch Manager were not authorized to engage casual labour. There was no relationship of employer and employee. It is stated that at Ujjain Branch two permanent staffs namely Shri Pankaj Joshi and Shri Ashok Thakur were working and therefore there was no question to take the services of others. It is also alleged that Shri Ram Nagwanshi cannot act as a representative of the alleged workman. It is submitted that the reference be answered in favour of the management.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are framed for adjudication-

- I. Whether there was relationship of employer and employee between the management Bank and the alleged workman?
- II. Whether the action of the management is not regularizing the services of Shri Kamlesh Bhartiya is justified?
- III. To what relief the workman is entitled?

#### 5. Issue No. I and II

For the sake of convenience both the issues are taken up together. It is also not out of place to say that initially the reference was started against the Bank of Rajasthan Ltd. but subsequently during the course of the proceeding the said Bank merged in ICICI Bank. As such ICICI Bank was also impleaded as party vide order dated 24-12-2010.

6. To prove the case, the workman Shri Kamlesh Bhartiya is examined in the case. He was supported his case in his evidence that the workman was engaged on 6-6-2011 by Shri Laxman Sharma, the then Manager to do the work of a

peon. The pleading shows that he was engaged on daily wages. He has stated that he was terminated w.e.f. 30-9-2002. In cross examination he has stated that he did not receive any appointment letter nor appeared in any interview of appointment. He has further stated that he has not certificate to show that he worked 240 days or more. He has not filed any document to show that his wages paid in the name of Shri Ashok Thakur and Pankaj Joshi. This clearly shows that there is no chit of paper to show relationship of employer and employee nor there is any document to show that he had worked in the branch of the Bank. He has stated that he wants service. This creates doubt in his evidence that instant case is filed for securing backdoor employment and the evidence appears to be not reliable.

7. On the other hand, the management has examined one witness. The management witness Shri Satyanarain Sharma is Manager-II in the Bank of Rajasthan Ltd. He has supported the case of the management. He has stated that it is wrong to say that the alleged workman was engaged against the permanent post of peon on 6-6-2001 and worked till 30-9-2002 continuously by the then Manager of the their Ujjain Branch of the Bank. He was never appointed against any post nor any appointment letter was issued. There is no record in the bank to show that he had worked in the bank against any post or otherwise. His evidence clearly shows that he was never engaged in the bank and therefore the question of violation of the provision of the Act, 1947 and the question of regularization in the bank service doesnot arise. He has been cross-examined at length but there is nothing to disbelieve this witness. This shows that there is no chit of paper to show that the workman was engaged in the bank and there was any relationship of employer and employee between the management and the alleged workman.

8. The learned counsel for the management submitted that there is recruitment rules in the Bank for appointment of sub staff in the Bank. Admittedly he was not allegedly appointed in the bank by the procedure for recruitment rules. As such the question of regularization doesnot arise. He has relied the decision reported in (2006)4 SCC 1 Secretary, State of Karnataka and others Vrs. Uma Devi and others, Considering the evidence adduced by the parties, it is clear that the alleged workman was not employed in the service of the Bank and there is no violation of the provision of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25 N of the Act, 1947 and the question of regularization in the service doesnot arise. Both issues are decided against the Union/workman and in favour of the management.

#### 9. Issue No. III

On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the Union/workman has no case and the alleged workman is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly the reference is answered.

10. In the result, the award is passed without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3144.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 29/2008) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/43/2007-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3144.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 29/2008) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 18-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/43/2007-IR (B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE SRI RAM PARKASH, HJS, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

#### Industrial Dispute No. 29 of 2008

Between

Sri Ved Prakash Pandey,

Son of Sri Rudra Narain Pandey,

Village Mahuwa,

Post Swadund,

District-Sidharth Nagar.

And

- (1) The Branch Manager,  
State Bank of India,  
Keshherha Branch (Code 3621),  
District Sidharth Nagar.
- (2) Regional Manager  
State Bank of India,  
Town Hall Building,  
Gorakhpur (UP).

#### AWARD

1. Central Government, Mol, New Delhi *vide* notification no. L-12012/43/2007-IR (B-1) dated 27-07-07 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal—

2. Whether the action of the management of Bhartiya State Bank Sidharth Nagar in terminating the services of Sri Ved Parkas Pandey son of Sri Rudra Narain Pandey Canteen boy cum messenger with effect from 03-01-2004 is legal and justified? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?

3. Briefly stated facts of the case of the claimant is that he was engaged by the opposite party bank at its Kheshraha Branch code no. 3621 in District Sidharthnagar, U.P. on 01-06-1993. The initial payment of salary of the claimant was Rs. 360 per month which was subsequently enhanced to Rs. 500 per month. The salary cheque was issued by the bank with the joint signature of Manager of the Bank and a member of the Local Implementation Committee. The salary cheques were issued to the claimant treating him to be a canteen boy but the work taken from the claimant was that of Messenger cum Peon. It is pertinent to mention here that the branch where the claimant was engaged by bank was not having any canteen therefore, question to engage the claimant as canteen boy in the said branch does not arise. The salary cheques issued by the bank under the joint signature of the manager and a member of award staff who is said to be the Secretary of Local Implementation Committee is to camouflage the whole issue but in fact the applicant was performing the work of Messenger cum Peon continuously from 1993. It is the further case of the claimant that he was regularly deputed to deliver the local daak and alone he was deputed to deliver daak to Regional office at Gorakhpur for which he was being paid travelling allowance by the branch manager of the branch alone and not by the joint signature of a member of Local Implementation Committee. It is also stated by the claimant that after delivering the daak at Regional Office Gorakhpur, he used to submit his T.A., Foodings and lodging Bills at the branch and those bills were settled by the branch manager by issued debit slip. The claimant has also details of debit slips issued in his favor by the bank in sub Para (a) to (e) of Para 7 of his statement of claimant showing the date and amount passed in his favor. It is further claimed by him that these debit slips demonstrate that the claimant was performing the regular work of Peon cum Messenger in the branch. On this ground it is also pleaded by the claimant that the opposite party bank be directed to produce the original debit slips through which the travelling allowance/ daily allowance was paid to the applicant and also the local daak register for the period 1993 and onwards which will demonstrate that the applicant was also delivering the local daak regularly.

4. The bank was regularly taking from the claimant the work of peon cum messenger but to cover up their illegal action they used to issue salary cheques in the joint signature of the branch manager and of a member. of the Local Implementation Committee which is clear violation of natural justice.



5. It is denied by the claimant that there ever existed any canteen at the branch where he was engaged. The payment vouchers of Tea and Snacks are present in the record of the bank which will indicate subsisted at the branch where the claimant was engaged. It is also the case of the claimant that when he raised his demand before the branch manager that he should also be paid wages as are being paid to regularly appointed peon cum messenger then the manager verbally removed his services with effect from 03.01.04 without giving him any opportunity of hearing, notice or retrenchment compensation therefore the opposite party did not follow the provisions of Section 25F and 25N of the Act whereas he has completed continuous services of about 11 years and during all the calendar years he had rendered for more than 240 days of service preceding the date of his removed.

6. On the basis of above it has been prayed by the claimant that he should be reinstated in the service of the bank with full back wages, seniority and other consequential benefits.

7. Opposite party has filed the written statement contradicting the aversion of the claimant. It is alleged that the claimant did not work in the office of the Regional Manager SBI Gorakhpur even for a day. But claimant deliberately arrayed him as a party. Only on this ground alone the claim is not maintainable. It is stated that claimant was the canteen boy engage by the Local Implementation Committee whereas LIC is not a banking Company, hence the claim is not maintainable. There is no relationship of employer and employee between the bank and the claimant. It is stated that the claimant had already worked as temporary messenger in the branch for a period of 86 days as per urgent need. Bank did not issue him any appointment letter and after this tenure there existed no relationship between the parties. In the bank for the welfare of the staff a fund is created. Canteen activities are one of them. The branch manager is the ex officio president of the said LIC. A current account in the staff welfare fund is opened in the branch which is operated by the Secretary and the member of LIC. LIC appoints the canteen boy for operating the activities of the canteen. Salaries are made by LIC to the canteen boy. It is also stated that at the material time there were sufficient messengers in the branch but due to urgent need the claimant offered himself then bank gave him opportunity to do needful. Thereafter the bank used to pay the expenses after producing the bills by the claimant. Primary duty of the claimant was of canteen boy. The incidental work cannot change his status. Claimant did not work continuously for more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of his removal therefore; the provisions of Section 25F of the Act do not come in picture in his case.

8. On the basis of above it has been pleaded by the opposite party that the claim of the petitioner is not maintainable and is liable to be rejected.

9. Rejoinder has also been filed by the claimant but nothing new has been pleaded therein.

10. Both parties have filed the documentary as well as oral evidence. Documentary evidence will be discussed during the examination of the oral evidence.

11. Claimant has produced himself as Ved Parkas Pandey Opposite party has produced M. W.I Sri Satya Narain Pandey who is retired branch manager who had been in the Kheshara Branch during the period September 2000 to October 2003.

12. The reference in this case is whether the action of the opposite party in terminating the services of the claimant canteen boy cum messenger is legal and justified.

13. Opposite party has claimed that he was engaged only in canteen being managed under local implementation committee at the branch but M.W.1 has admitted in the cross this fact that the claimant has been working as a canteen boy since 1993 to 2004, so this fact has been established that the claimant had been working. Now the claim of the claimant is that there is no such type of canteen in the branch and in the garb of a canteen boy the work of a messenger was being taken from him.

14. Now a short question to be decided in this case is whether the claimant was being treated as a canteen boy cum messenger during this period.

15. Claimant has summoned the local delivery book and certain other vouchers and TA bills from the opposite party. The delivery book is in original. At some of the pages in the column of messenger the name of the claimant is shown. When a question was put to MW.1 he has admitted but stated that the clerks used to write his name in the delivered book. Whereas the claimant has stated that at page no. 20-22-31 he has delivered the daak. Page no.13 dated 09-08-96 he delivered the daak, page no.34, 35, 37, 38 which bears different dates he has delivered the daak. Similarly at page no.43 and so on, page no.60 dated 28-10-03 and dated 12-12-03, he has delivered the daak. He has stated that he has wrongly stated the fact that he has delivered the daak on 13-04-04 which he could not understand the question. I think that this mistake is ignorable. He has claimed that these entries in the daak register are in his hand writing. Apart from serving the local daak he used to serve the out stationed daak and he was used to be paid for that TA and expenses and these papers are 121-14, which are bills and vouchers. He further stated that he used to be sent to the Zonal Office of the Bank at Gorakhpur for serving the daak for which bank used to pay him the TA and expenses. He also used to do other misc. work at the branch.

16. Mere denial by MW 1 that these entries are not in the hand writing of the claimant is not acceptable whereas he himself has admitted that the name of the claimant as messenger has been written by the concerned clerks of the bank. This fortifies the claim of the claimant.

17. From the statement of W.W. 1 and M.W. 1 and from the documents which have been filed it can be easily inferred that the work of the messenger was being taken from the claimant.

18. Now the contention of the bank that he was being paid Rs.500 per month by the President of LIC. They have also filed certain ledger sheet papers from page no. 152-15/5 as well as cheques in original which are paper no. 15/6-14. This shows that the bank was taking the work from the claimant treating him as a canteen boy but the work of the messenger was also taken.

19. Therefore, from the facts it can be inferred that the work of canteen boy-cum-messenger was taken from the workman since the date of his engagement till the date of his termination. M.W.1 has clearly admitted in his evidence that the claimant had worked continuously during the period 1993 till the date of his termination leaving leave and holidays.

20. The opposite party has also admitted in his written statement that the claimant had worked for 86 days in the bank, but they have not clearly disclosed the period of this working. Evidence has also not been given in this shape. Whereas in the evidence it has been shown that the claimant had never been engaged by the bank as messenger even for a single day which is contradictory to the own pleadings of the bank raised in their reply. Therefore the version of the bank which is a model employer of the country and it is expected from the bank that they will come with clean hands before a forum of law, in such the version as well as evidence of the bank is not acceptable. W. W.1 has been cross-examined at length. There is nothing in his evidence which make his evidence disbelievable, therefore, it is found that the claimant has been working continuously in the bank with effect from 01-06-93 to 03-01-2004, who was being treated as canteen boy-cum-messenger.

21. It has also been stated by W.W. 1 that before removal of his services the bank has neither paid him retrenchment compensation, notice pay or retrenchment notice. This fact appears to be proved by the evidence of parties.

22. Therefore in the given facts and circumstances of the case the action of the opposite party was not found to be legal and justified in terminating the services of the claimant Sri Ved Parkas Pandey. Therefore he is entitled to be reinstated in the service. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case he is entitled to 30% of back wages, but further considering the facts and circumstances of the case it is held that he is not entitled to regular salary of peon-cum-messenger with effect from 01-06-93 or from the date of termination as claimed by him.

Date : 4-9-12

RAM PARKASH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3145.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. बीसीडी एजेन्सी प्रा. लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 2, मुम्बई के पंचाट पार्ट-II (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-2/66 ऑफ 2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-31011/15/2003-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3145.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT-2/66 of 2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No-2, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCD Agency Pvt. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-09-2012.

[No. L-31011/15/2003-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.2, MUMBAI

#### PRESENT

K.B. KATAKE, Presiding Officer

#### REFERENCE NO. CGIT -2/66 of 2003

EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE MANAGEMENT  
OF

M/S. B.C.D.AGENCY PVT. LTD.

The Director

M/s. BCD Agency Pvt. Ltd.

105, Vyapar Bhavan, 1st floor

49, P. D' mello Road, Mumbai-400 009.

AND

THEIR WORKMEN.

The President

Transport & Dock Workers Union

P.D' mello Bhavan

P.D' mello Road,

Carnac Bunder,

Mumbai -400 038.

**APPEARANCES:**

FOR THE EMPLOYER: Mr. M.B. Anchan, Advocate

FOR THE WORKMEN: Mr. A.M. Koyande, Advocate

Mumbai, dated the 30th July, 2012.

**AWARD PART-II**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment by its Order No.L-31011/15/2003-IR (B-II), dated 29-09-2003 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. BCD Agency Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai by terminating the services of Shri Dilip Adhar Kumar Adhikari, Custom Clerk w. e.f. 30-11-2002 is justified or not? If not, what relief the workman, Shri Dilip A. Kumar Adhikari is entitled to?”

2. The second party workman was charge-sheeted for altercation with office staff members Mrs. Shaila Mahadik on 20-02-2002. He was also chargesheeted for not getting shipment papers *i.e.* AR-4 and mate receipts belonging to M/s Taurus Chemicals and Lyka Exports Ltd. kept in the locker of the company at CWC Dronagiri and the workman asked Mr. Kashid not to proceed without his consent. He was also charged for late arrival and misbehavior and non co-operation with M/s. IPCA, LAPS Ltd. and did not meet the drivers of M/s. Devram Tukaram Shinde promptly and threatened and abused them and made them to wait for long hours. They voiced their grievance to the first party for his poor performance not phoned to them after reporting to update and reporting late in the office and remained absent on 22-02-2002 on the date of memo. Company sustained heavy loss because of second party workman. For all these charges, inquiry was conducted against the second party workman. On the basis of report of the inquiry officer the service of second party workman came to be terminated.

3. The second party workman raised industrial dispute before the Labour Commissioner. As conciliation failed, the Labour Commissioner submitted his report to the Labour Ministry. The Labour Ministry sent reference to this Tribunal. In response to the notice the second party appeared in this reference. The second party workman filed his statement of claim at Ex-9. According to him the inquiry was not fair and proper. The IO was bias and the findings of the IO are perverse. According to him, he has not committed any such mischief. Therefore he prays that the order of termination be set aside and he be reinstated in the service with full back wages, continuity of service and consequential benefits.

4. The first party management resisted the statement of claim by filing their written statement at Ex-22. They denied

that inquiry was not fair and proper and findings were perverse. According to them sufficient opportunity was given to the workman and the findings of IO are not perverse. The charges were proved against the workman and the punishment of removal from service is just and proper. Therefore they pray that the reference be rejected with cost. After framing the issues, issues nos. 1 and 2 in respect of fairness of inquiry and perversity of findings were treated as preliminary issues. My Ld. Predecessor in Award Part-I dt. 19-05-2009 held that inquiry was not fair and proper and findings are perverse and first party was directed to justify their action.

5. Following are the issues re-casted for my determination in this part-II award. I record my findings thereon for the reasons to follow:

Sr. No.	Issues	Findings
1.	Whether first party has proved the alleged misconduct against the workman?	Yes
2.	If yes, whether the punishment of termination is proportionate to the proved misconduct?	Yes
3.	Whether the workman is entitled to be reinstated ?	No
4.	What order ?	As per final order.

**REASONS****Issue no.1**

6. To prove the guilt management has led evidence of two witnesses. MW-1 Mr. Gopalkrishna Narayan Pai has filed his affidavit at Ex-37. MW-2 Shaila Mahadik has filed her affidavit at Ex-40. Shri G. N. Pai is one of the Directors of the first party company. He says in his affidavit at Ex-37 that the second party was employed as Custom Clerk in the Export Division. His duty was to receive export cargo documents and present the same before the Customs. He further says that he was not punctual in his duties and due to his late attendance memo dt. 31/01/2000 (Ex-71) was issued to him. He further says that he was to attend their customer IPCA. However he did not attend and they verified that he was not at the work place and they found that most of the time he was not available at the work place. He had neglected the work and due to his negligence company had suffered huge financial loss and loss to IPCA, M/s. Taurus Chemicals and M/s. Lyka Export Ltd. He further says that those companies had given complaints against second party workman. He further says that second party workman took all export related documents of M/s. Taurus Chemicals and M/s. Lyka Export Ltd. from Mr. H.C. Kashid and kept those documents in his custody. He did not produce these documents before the Customs and



deliberately hid them in the locker, due to which company sustained great loss. It is also contended in his affidavit that company had given him mobile phone and motor bike. Mobile bill shows he was misusing the mobile phone for his personal calls. It has further come in his affidavit that due to his late attendance and misbehaviour he was transferred to Mumbai Office and was asked to do the desk work. He further says that, on 20-02-2002 he misbehaved with a female employee Shaila Mahadik and she has submitted a written complaint against him. A complaint was also lodged to Police. This witness further says that the workman had accepted illegal gratification from their transporter M/s. Shree Ashapura. They have made a written complaint to that effect to the first party.

7. This witness is one of the Directors of the company. There is no suggestion to him as to why he is deposing falsely against a workman who is a Clerk in his company. His version is supported by the memo dated 31-01-2000 (Ex-71) wherein warning was given to the workman for late attendance and not contacting them on phone every day in the morning to take further instructions in respect of the work. Neither he has any enmity with the workman nor there is any allegation of victimization. Thus his version inspires confidence in respect of the charges of late attendance, mischief in respect of documents and misbehaviour with some of their customers.

8. The second witness Shaila Mahadik Ex-40 has contended in her affidavit that, on 20-02-2002 the second party workman misbehaved with her. She says that after finishing her work in the computer cabin, when she came out of the cabin she found that, the workman was sitting on her chair. She requested him to vacate her chair. According to her workman refused to vacate her chair and raised his voice. He asked her whether her name is written on the chair. His approach was aggressive and very rude. He threatened her with dire consequence and also threatened to see her. She further says that, at that time she was crying and got afraid of and approached to the Director immediately for action. She had given written complaint against him. In her cross-examination it was suggested that since no chair was available second party sat on her chair. It indicates that the incident is not totally false and there is substance in the allegation that the second party had occupied the chair of Smt. Shaila Mahadik and had altercation with her. It supports the version of the witness Mrs. Shaila Mahadik that the workman had misbehaved with her when she asked him to vacate her chair. The workman has not explained as to why she has made complaint and allegations against him. From the cross examinations of both these witnesses, no adverse fact has come on record. They have no enmity or any grudge against the second party. They are independent witnesses. Both these witnesses have no reason to make false allegations

against the workman. On the other hand their version is supported by the documents and facts on record. From their evidence it is revealed that both these witnesses are trustworthy and their testimony can safely be relied upon. Thus I hold that first party has proved the alleged misconduct against the workman. Accordingly, I decide the re-casted issue no.1 in the affirmative.

## Issue No. 2

9. On the point of punishment the Ld. adv. for the second party submitted that the allegations in respect of late attendance, hiding the documents, not attending and neglecting the clients are of general and vague nature. He further submitted that the charge of altercation with female employee Mrs. Shaila Mahadik is also not of a serious nature. It was pointed out that as there was shortage of chairs and sitting arrangements, the workman has sat on the chair of Smt. Shaila Mahadik. He had no intention either to insult her or to cause her any inconvenience. Therefore, the Ld. adv. for the second party submitted that the extreme punishment of dismissal or removal from service is shockingly disproportionate to the alleged misconduct.

10. As against this, the Ld. adv. for the first party submitted that the charges of late attendance, leaving the office without intimation, not attending the clients, hiding documents of clients and not producing it before them, keeping some clients waiting; all these acts of the workman caused great loss to the first party company. Due to these acts first party company not only suffered financial loss but it also affected their reputation adversely. The Ld. adv. further submitted that due to such behaviour of an employee of the company, company has sustained loss and also his behaviour caused harm to the reputation to the company. He further submitted that such an employee cannot be tolerated in any institution. The charges are very serious causing loss to the company and its clients. The behaviour of the workman also caused great harm to the reputation to the company. Therefore, he submitted that, the dismissal or removal from service is adequate punishment for such misbehaviour. The Ld. adv. for the first party further submitted that it is common experience of exploitation of female employees. Such tendency needs to be checked with iron hands. In the light of above misbehaviour of the workman, the misbehaviour with female colleagues shows the tendency of the workman. He submitted that the tendency of the workman is to create difficulty and problem to the others wherever he goes. The Ld. adv. further submitted that such a workman cause harm to the workman and their unions. Many such workmen are being maintained in corporate sector with the blessings of their unions. In my opinion the submission of Ld. adv. for the first party are not far away from truth. The movement of unions is also affected by extending protection to such wanton workmen. In my opinion the charges proved against the workman indicates that he is not only harmful to his colleagues but



he is also acting against the interest of the employer. Though first party has not produced any specific evidence to show the actual financial loss to them, the clients who sustained financial loss, inconvenience and insult ultimately cause to affect the business of the first party. Furthermore I would like to point out that the workman behaved arrogantly with his female colleague which also cannot be viewed lightly. In this backdrop I come to the conclusion that the punishment of termination of services of the workman is quite proportionate to the proved misconduct. Accordingly I decide this issue no.2 also in the affirmative.

### Issue nos. 3 and 4

11. In the light of above discussions, I come to the conclusion that workman is not entitled to be reinstated. Thus I proceed to pass the following order :

### ORDER

The reference stands rejected with no order as to cost.

Date : 30-07-2012 K.B. KATAKE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3146.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मुम्बई पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-1, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-1/83 ऑफ 2004) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-31011/7/2004-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3146.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT-1/83 of 2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-1, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mumbai Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-09-2012.

[No. L-31011/7/2004-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

### ANNEXURE

### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

**Present :** JUSTICE G. S. SARRAF, Presiding Officer

### Reference No. CGIT-1/83 of 2004

**Parties:** Employers in relation to the management of Mumbai Port Trust

**And**

Their workmen.

### Appearances :

For the Management : Mr. Umesh Nabar, Adv.

For the Union : Ms. Kunda Samant, Adv.

State : Maharashtra

Mumbai, the 30th day of August, 2012

### AWARD

The brief facts leading to the present controversy may be stated thus. On 1-8-1996 a tally and sorting clerk was arrested by Yellow Gate Police Station in case of theft of cargo at 'F' Princess Dock. It is alleged that the workmen instigated all the tally clerks to strike down the work from second shift of 3-8-1996 which crippled the operations at the port till the second shift of 6-8-1996. It is further alleged that on 5-8-1996 the workmen led a mob of about two hundred employees to the office of M.B.I. Kazi, Deputy Manager who indulged in disorderly behaviour and abused Kazi and shouted slogans. It is further alleged that the mob led by the workmen gheraoed and detained the Officers of the first party for more than seven hours. It is also alleged that some persons led by the workmen went to the residential quarters of the first party at 'Sangam' at Colaba where they disturbed the peace and tranquillity of the colony. The six workmen alongwith two others were chargesheeted for the misconduct and an enquiry was held against them under Regulation No.12 of the Mumbai Port Trust Employees (Classification, Control and Appeal) Regulations, 1976. The Enquiry Officer vide report dt.26-11-1998 held that the charges against the six workmen and two others were not proved. The Disciplinary Authority however, did not agree with the report of the Enquiry Officer and ordered penalty of reduction of pay in time scale and further ordered that the delinquent employees would not earn any increment during the period of penalty. The delinquent employees dissatisfied with the order of the Disciplinary Authority preferred appeals under the Regulations. The Appellate Authority set aside the order of the Disciplinary Authority and remanded the matters back to the Disciplinary Authority for further enquiry and fresh orders. Pursuant thereto the delinquent employees were served with show cause notices as the Disciplinary Authority was not in agreement with the findings of the Enquiry Officer. Aggrieved by the issuance of the show cause notices proposing penalty of compulsory retirement a writ petition No. 999 of 2002 was filed in the Bombay High Court by the six workmen and one another employee. By judgement dt. 5-7-2002 passed in the above writ petition the Bombay High Court directed the Disciplinary Authority

to take into consideration the reply/explanation objectively and pass appropriate order in accordance with law and the petitioners were granted time of one month to file reply/explanation to the show cause notices served upon them by the Disciplinary Authority. It was also held that in case the petitioners felt aggrieved by the order of the Disciplinary Authority then they would be free to challenge the said order in accordance with law. The six workmen filed replies to the show cause notices. The Disciplinary Authority after considering the entire matter imposed the punishment of compulsory retirement. The workmen filed an appeal. The Appellate Authority upheld the order of the Disciplinary Authority.

Out of the eight delinquent employees one Chavan accepted the penalty imposed upon him of reduction of pay by five stages and one Meenakshi Sundaram accepted the punishment of compulsory retirement but the workmen raised an industrial dispute.

The Central Government then in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) has made this reference. The terms of reference given in the schedule are as follows:

Whether the action of the management of Mumbai Port Trust in termination of employment by way of compulsory retirement of S/Shri Anil Mohan Shejwadkar, Vijay Bhikaji Karalkar, Vijay Baburao Patil, Suleman Ibrahim Kadaria, Arnold Lobo, Motilal Ladusingh, Tally and Sorting Clerks and GPM Hatchforeman of OBL Section w.e.f. 30-7-2002 is justified? If not, what relief these six employees are entitled to?

According to the statement of claim filed by the Transport and Dock Workers Union (hereinafter referred to as the Union) the punishment of compulsory retirement imposed against the workmen is illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory, unreasonable, improper, invalid, perverse, unjust and void and, therefore, it is liable to be set aside and the workmen are entitled to be reinstated with full back wages, continuity of service and the attendant benefits.

On the other hand, the first party has prayed that the reference be rejected.

Out of the six workmen two—Vijay Bhikaji Karalkar and Vijay Baburao Patil—have expired. The legal Representatives of the deceased workman Vijay Baburao Patil have been taken on record by order dt.3-5-2012 of this Tribunal.

Following Issues have been framed on 13-10-2006 :

- (1) Whether the departmental enquiry held against the workmen is fair and proper?
- (2) Whether the report of the Enquiry Officer is perverse?
- (3) Whether punishment of compulsory retirement given to the workmen is proper and justified?

(4) What order?

Following Additional Issue has been framed on 2-11-2006. Whether the management proves that the report of the Enquiry Officer is perverse?

Following Additional Issue has been framed on 26-8-2012.

Whether the Disciplinary Authority of the first party employer proves that he was justified in awarding the punishment of compulsory retirement against the second party workmen?

The Union has filed six affidavits and the witnesses have been cross examined by learned counsel for the first party.

Heard Ms. Samant learned counsel on behalf of the Union and Mr. Nabar learned counsel on behalf of the first party.

#### **ISSUE NO. 1**

The workmen were not found guilty by the Enquiry Officer and, therefore, learned counsel for the Union does not press this Issue. It is, therefore, held that the departmental enquiry held against the workmen was fair and proper and Issue no.1 is decided accordingly.

#### **ISSUE NO. 2. AND ADDITIONAL ISSUE FRAMED**

**ON 2-11-2006:** The workmen were not found guilty by the Enquiry Officer and, therefore, learned counsel for the Union does not press this Issue. It is, therefore, held that the report of the Enquiry Officer is not perverse and Issue No. 2 and Additional Issue framed on 2-11-2006 are decided accordingly.

#### **ISSUE NO. 3 AND ADDITIONAL ISSUE FRAMED ON 26-8-2010**

Honourable Bombay High Court in its judgement dt. 5-4-2002 passed in writ petition no-999 of 2002 has held as under :

The reasons which have been recorded by the Disciplinary Authority for not being in agreement with the finding of Enquiry Officer cannot be said to be cryptic or no reasons at all. As the petitioners have been given show cause notice for proposed penalty by the Disciplinary Authority, it is open to the petitioners to appear before the Disciplinary Authority and set up their defence and show cause why the proposed penalty should not be awarded. Obviously, upon petitioners appearance and the explanation submitted by them, the Disciplinary Authority will take into consideration the cause and explanation submitted by them and pass appropriate order thereon. If the petitioners are aggrieved by the order so passed by the Disciplinary Authority, it is always open to them to challenge such order in appeal under Regulations. It would be, thus, seen that no prejudice at this stage can be said to have been

caused to the petitioners by issuance of show cause notices. The petitioners have adequate remedy of showing cause before the Disciplinary Authority and if aggrieved by the ultimate order of the Disciplinary Authority prefer appeal under Regulations.

All in all, no case for invocation of writ jurisdiction is made out.

Dismissed in limine.

As regards the order of the Disciplinary Authority holding the workmen guilty and issuing show cause notice proposing the punishment of compulsory retirement, honourable High Court has held that the reasons recorded by the Disciplinary Authority for not being in agreement with the finding of the Enquiry Officer cannot be said to be cryptic or no reasons at all and thereafter has dismissed the write petition in limine.

The question now remains that whether the punishment of Compulsory retirement is proper and justified?

Section 11A of the Act is applicable only in the cases of dismissal or discharge of a workman as clearly mentioned in the Section itself. In this case the punishment is compulsory retirement and not dismissal or discharge and, therefore, Section 11A of the Act is not applicable.

This Tribunal does not act as a Court of Appeal and substitute its own judgement for that of the Disciplinary Authority. This Tribunal interferes only when there is want of good faith, victimisation, unfair labour practice etc. on the part of the management. There is no proof of any such allegation in this case.

This Tribunal is not a forum whose task is to dole out private benevolence to the workmen found guilty of misconduct. The jurisdiction to interfere with the punishment awarded by the Disciplinary Authority should be exercised only when the punishment is shockingly disproportionate to the degree of guilt of the workmen. I do not think that the punishment is shockingly disproportionate in this case so as to warrant interference by this Tribunal.

For the reasons stated above I am of the opinion that punishment of compulsory retirement given to the workmen is proper and justified.

**Issue No. 3 :** and Additional Issue framed on 26-8-2010 are decided against the workmen.

**Issue No. 4 :** The workmen are not entitled to any relief. Award is passed accordingly.

JUSTICE G. S. SARRAF, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ.3147.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ बड़ौदा के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में

निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-1, मुम्बई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी-1/42 ऑफ 2004) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/219/2003-आई आर (बी-II)]

शीश राम, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3147.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT-1/42 of 2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-1, Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Baroda and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/219/2003-IR(B-II)]

SHEESH RAM, Section Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI

**Present :** Justice G. S. SARRAF, Presiding Officer

**Reference No. CGIT-1/42 of 2004**

**Parties :** Employers in relation to the management of Bank of Baroda

**And**

Their workman (B.M.Gavali)

#### Appearances :

For Bank of Baroda : Shri Lancy D'Souza

For the workman : Shri Amberkar, Adv.

State : Maharashtra

Mumbai, dated the 3rd day of September, 2012

#### AWARD

1. This is a reference made by the Central Government in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act). The terms of reference given in the schedule are as follows:

Whether the action of the management of Bank of Baroda in terminating the service of Shri Bhaskar M.Gavali w.e.f. 7-1-2003 is legal and justified? If not, what relief is the concerned workman entitled to?

2. According to the statement of claim the workman Bhaskar M.Gavali was employed by the Bank of Baroda (hereinafter referred to as the Bank) in 1996 as a peon at its Bordi Branch. The workman was given breaks from May 1996 to November 1998 and thereafter he was posted on the post of one Surati who was working as a peon with the Bank and was remaining absent frequently. From the year

1998 onwards till the date of his termination *i.e.* 7-1-2003 the workman worked continuously for more than 240 days in a year with the Bank. He was terminated in violation of the provisions contained in Section 25-F of the Act. His termination is illegal, mala fide and bad in law. The workman has, therefore, prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service *w.e.f.* 7-1-2003.

3. According to the written statement filed by the Bank the workman was working on casual/temporary basis on daily wages when required. His non-engagement does not amount to termination of service or retrenchment under the provisions of the Act. The workman was engaged by the Branch Manager of the Bank who had no authority to recruit sub-staff even on temporary basis and when the initial entry of the workman was illegal he had no right to continue in the service of the Bank. The Bank is a nationalised Bank and appointment to any post in the Bank is governed by Statutory Rules/Regulations in force from time to time. Any appointment in the subordinate cadre had to be made by an authority competent to make such appointment on a sanctioned vacancy and subject to fulfilment of eligibility criteria. The Bank engages casual employees on daily wages when its regular sub-staff are absent and/or as and when required due to exigency of work. The General Manager (HRM) of the Bank is the sole competent authority to authorise/sanction vacancy in subordinate cadre whether for temporary or regular appointment. The Bank has denied that the workman worked continuously for more than 240 days in a year. The Bank has also stated that the workman does not acquire the status of Bank employee on mere completion of 240 days in a year. Hence according to the Bank the disengagement of the workman cannot be construed as retrenchment under Section 25-F of the Act. The Bank has, therefore, prayed that the reference be rejected.

4. The workman has filed rejoinder wherein he has reiterated his stand.

5. The workman has filed his affidavit and he has been cross-examined by learned counsel for the Bank. The Bank has filed affidavit of Arup Kumar Mitra, Branch Head who has been cross examined by learned counsel for the workman.

6. Heard Shri Amberkar learned counsel for the workman and Shri Lancy D'Souza learned counsel for the Bank.

7. It is not disputed that the workman was a casual employee on daily wages basis and he did work for more than 240 days during the period of twelve calendar months preceding his alleged termination.

8. The question is that whether the alleged termination of the workman amounts to retrenchment and whether the workman is entitled to reinstatement because of non-fulfilment of conditions preceding to retrenchment under Section 25-F of the Act?

9. In AIR 1997 SC 3657 it has been held that:

Every Department of the Government cannot be treated to be "industry". When the appointments are regulated by the statutory rules, the concept of "industry" to that extent stands excluded. Admittedly, they were not appointed to the posts in accordance with the rules but were engaged on the basis of need of the work. They are temporary employees working on daily wages. Under these circumstances, their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be a retrenchment under the Industrial Disputes Act. The concept of "retrenchment", therefore, cannot be stretched to such an extent as to cover these employees.

10. In 2006 II CLR 261 honourable Apex Court has again held as under:

While directing that appointments, temporary or casual, be regularized or made permanent, courts are swayed by the fact that the concerned person has worked for some time and in some cases for a considerable length of time. It is not as if the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature, is not aware of the nature of his employment. He accepts the employment with eyes open. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain— not at arms length—since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the Constitutional scheme of appointment and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is not permissible. If the court were to void a contractual employment of this nature on the ground that the parties were not having equal bargaining power, that too would not enable the court to grant any relief to that employee. A total embargo on such casual or temporary employment is not possible, given the exigencies of administration and if imposed, would only mean that some people who at least get employment temporarily, contractually or casually, would not be getting even that employment when securing of such employment brings at least some succor to them. After all, innumerable citizens of our vast country are in search of employment and one is not compelled to accept a casual or temporary employment if one is not inclined to go in for such an employment. It is in that context that one has to proceed on the basis that the employment was accepted fully knowing the nature of it and the consequences flowing from it. In other words, even while accepting the employment, the person



concerned knows the nature of his employment. It is not an appointment to a post in the real sense of the term. The claim acquired by him in the post in which he is temporarily employed or the interest in that post cannot be considered to be of such a magnitude as to enable the giving up of the procedure established, for making regular appointments to available posts in the services of the State. The argument that since one has been working for some time in the post, it will not be just to discontinue him, even though he was aware of the nature of the employment when he first took it up, is not one that would enable the jettisoning of the procedure established by law for public employment and would have to fail when tested on the touchstone of Constitutionality and equality of opportunity enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

11. In 2006 (110) FLR 773 honourable Apex Court has held that it is the settled preposition of law that when the initial appointment itself is void then the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act are not applicable while terminating the services of the workman.

12. There is no appointment letter. The workman was appointed not in accordance with the procedure of appointment. The Branch Manager who appointed him was not authorised to make such appointment. The workman was appointed as casual employee on daily wages basis. Therefore, assuming that the workman worked for more than 240 days during the period of twelve calendar months preceding his alleged termination, in view of the above decisions of honourable Apex Court, I am of the view that disengagement or termination of the services of the workman does not amount to retrenchment and there is no question of giving any relief to the workman on ground of non-compliance of the provisions Section 25-F of the Act.

13. For the reasons stated above the disengagement/termination of the workman cannot be said to be illegal or unjustified.

The workman is thus not entitled to any relief.

Award is passed accordingly.

Justice G. S. SARRAF, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ.3148.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स मैसूर मिनरल्स लिमिटेड, बेंगलूर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बेंगलूर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 34/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/18/2003-आई आर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3148.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 34/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Mysore Minerals Ltd. (Bangalore) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2012.

[No. L-29012/18/2003-IR (M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

“SHRAM SADAN”,

III MAIN, III CROSS, II PHASE, TUMKUR ROAD,  
YESHWANTHPUR,

BANGALORE - 560 022

Dated: 10th July, 2012

**Present :** Shri S.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

**C.R. No. 34/2003**

#### IPARTY

Shri Puttaswamy Chari,  
S/o Dasachari,  
Yachanaghatta,  
Nuggehalli Hobli,  
Santa Shivara,  
HASSAN

#### II PARTY

The Managing Director,  
Mysore Minerals Limited,  
No. 39, M.G. Road,  
Bangalore - 560001

#### AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred this dispute vide order No. L-29011/18/2003-IR(M) dated 04-06-2003 for adjudication on the following Schedule:

#### SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Mysore Minerals Limited is justified in dismissing the services of Shri Puttaswamy Chari with retrospective effect? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the reference pursuant to the notices issued by this tribunal first party as well as the second party entered their appearances through their respective advocates and filed claim statement and counter statement. After completion of the pleadings my learned Predecessor while framing a Preliminary Issue as to “Whether the domestic enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is fair and proper, after receiving the evidence

of the enquiry officer as MW1 and exhibiting copies of enquiry proceedings; enquiry findings and dismissal order dated 12-08-1998 as Ex. M1 to M3 for the management and hearing the arguments addressed by the learned advocates appearing for both sides by his order dated 19-05-2006 answered the preliminary issue in the 'negative' holding that the domestic enquiry conducted by the second party against the first party is 'not fair and proper'. Thereafter affording several opportunities to the second party to lead evidence to substantiate the charge since the same was not availed, by his award dated 1-08-2006 directed the management to reinstate the first party workman in its service to the post he held at the time of impugned dismissal order with full back wages from 1-06-2003 till the date of his reinstatement with continuity of service for the above said period and all other consequential benefits. When this award was assailed by the management before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP No. 17098/2006(L-RES) the hon'ble High Court by order dated 7th March, 2007 while observing the lapse on the part of the workman seeking for reference of the dispute after a period of 5 years of dismissal ought to have been considered, set aside the award and remanded the matter. After remand the first party filed rejoinder to the counter statement but both parties did not lead any evidence and the learned counsel appearing for the first party filed his written arguments. Whereas the learned counsel appearing for the second party addressed his arguments submitting that the first party being dismissed in 1998 raised the dispute in the year 2003 after a lapse of about of about 5 years after availing all benefits without explanation, he is not entitle for any relief.

3. The case of the first party in brief is that he who joined the services of the second party in the year 1985 as a Mining Worker and was rendering his services diligently and honestly in the year 1997 due to Industrial Health Hazardousness was suffering from Appendix and undergone surgery but even thereafter due to his ill health he availed sick leave from 2-05-1998 and when want to report duty on 23-5-1998 he was not permitted to resume duty and he once again reported duty on 11-06-1998 with medical certificate but instead of allowing him to report for duty his medical certificate was torn of and one Mr. Thimmegowda, foreman working in the management took his signature on some papers and thereafter converted them into enquiry proceedings and on the basis of the finding of the enquiry officer holding him guilty on the charges of unauthorized absence from duty w.e.f. 2-05-1998 terminated his service by order dated 12-08-1998 giving retrospective effect from 2-05-1998 and inspite of his several requests the latest by way of representation dated 31-08-2001 no action was being taken to reinstate him as such he is entitle for reinstatement with continuity of service, back wages and other consequential benefits. The management in its counter statement contentding that the first party since remained absent from duty unauthorisedly from 2-05-1998

despite memos issued on 18-05-1998 and 11-06-1998 to report for duty with due explanation for his unauthorized absence and since failed to respond the domestic enquiry was initiated and as the enquiry officer after due enquiry submitted his finding the charge being proved the impugned order dated 12-08-1998 dismissing him from service w.e.f. 2-05-1998 the date from which he remained absent being passed it is just and proper.

4. As already adverted to by me above, though the domestic enquiry is set aside holding the same as 'not fair and proper' by order dated 19th May, 2006 even after the remand by Hon'ble High Court the second party failed to lead evidence to substantiate the charge of unauthorized absence. Only because the first party in his claim statement did not dispute having remained absent from 2-05-1998 that itself is not sufficient to treat his absence since he has further as unauthorized absence because he has further asserted that due to the Industrial Health Hazardousness in the year 1997 as he was suffering from Appendix and undergone surgery and even thereafter he continued to be suffering from ill health availed sick leave from 2-5-1998 but the management without sanctioning the sick leave conducted a farce of enquiry and treated his absence as unauthorized and passed the impugned dismissal order. Even in the arguments addressed before me by the learned advocate appearing for the second party it was only submitted that because the date of dismissal *i.e.* of the year 1998, the dispute being raised in the year 2003 after a lapse of about 5 years he is not entitle for any relief. But with due respect to the learned advocate appearing for the second party only delay in raising the dispute cannot be a ground to substantiate the impugned action and the delay can be considered while granting other reliefs. Therefore, only because there is a delay of 5 years in getting the reference made for adjudication the reference cannot be rejected or the impugned action of the management can be held as justified. Since as already adverted to by me above, the second party having failed to lead evidence inspite of setting aside the domestic enquiry on the ground that it was not fair and proper, this being a case of no evidence only because the first party had remained absent from 2-5-1998 the action of the management dismissing him for unauthorized absence cannot be justified. However, having regard to the unexplained delay of about 5 years in raising the dispute from the date of dismissal and having regard to the nature of the job of the first party and no evidence is adduced being not gainfully employed I feel it just and appropriate to deny the back wages. Under the circumstances I pass the following award:

#### AWARD

The reference is allowed holding that the action of the management of Mysore Minerals in dismissing the services of the workman Shri Puttaswamy Chari with retrospective effect is not justified and that he is entitle for reinstatement

in its service to the post he held at the time of impugned dismissal order with continuity of service and all other consequential benefits without any back wages. In case the second party failed to give him an order of reinstatement within one month from the date of publication of the award from such date the second party will be liable to pay him the wages applicable to him from that day onwards till he is actually reinstated.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 10-7-2012).

S.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer  
नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3149.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स मैसूर मिनेरल्स लिमिटेड, बैंगलोर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बैंगलोर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 35/2003) प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/16/2003-आई आर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3149.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 35/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Mysore Minerals Ltd. (Bangalore) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2012.

[No. L-29012/16/2003-IR (M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT “SHRAM SADAN”,

III MAIN, III CROSS, II PHASE, TUMKUR ROAD,  
YESHWANTHPUR, BANGALORE-560022

Dated: 10th July, 2012

**PRESENT :** Shri S. N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

**C.R. No. 35/2003**

#### I PARTY

Shri Thimmaiah,  
S/o Late Thimmaiah,  
Nagara Navile Village & PO,  
Bagur Hobli,  
CR Patna Taluk,  
Hassan Distt.,  
Hasan.

#### II PARTY

The Managing Director,  
Mysore Minerals Limited,  
No. 39, M.G. Road,  
Bangalore -560001

#### AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred this dispute vide order No. L-29012/16/2003-IR(M) dated 4th June, 2003 for adjudication on the following Schedule :

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Mysore Minerals Limited is justified in dismissing the services of the workman Shri Thimmaiah with retrospective effect? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. After receipt of the reference pursuant to the notices issued by this tribunal first party as well as the second party entered their appearances through their respective advocates and filed claim statement and counter statement. After completion of the pleadings my learned Predecessor while framing a Preliminary Issue as to "Whether the domestic enquiry conducted against the first party by the second party is fair and proper, after receiving the evidence of the enquiry officer as MW1 and exhibiting copies of the enquiry notice; enquiry proceedings, enquiry findings and dismissal order dated 12-8-1998 as Ex. M1 to M4 for the management and hearing the arguments addressed by the learned advocates appearing for both sides, my learned predecessor by his order dated 19-5-2006 answered the preliminary issue in the 'negative' holding that the domestic enquiry conducted by the second party against the first party is 'not fair and proper'. Thereafter affording several opportunities to the second party to lead evidence to substantiate the charge since the same was not availed, by his award dated 01-08-2006 directed the management to reinstate the first party workman in its service to the post he held at the time of impugned dismissal order with full back wages from 1-06-2003 till the date of his reinstatement with continuity of service for the above said period and all other consequential benefits. When this award was assailed by the management before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in WP No. 17099/2006(L-RES), the hon'ble High Court by order dated 7th March, 2007 while observing the lapse on the part of the workman seeking for reference of the dispute after a period of 5 years of dismissal ought to have been considered set aside the award and remanded the matter. After remand the first party filed rejoinder to the counter statement but both parties did not lead any evidence and the learned counsel appearing for the first party filed his written arguments, whereas the learned counsel appearing for the second party addressed his arguments submitting that the first party being dismissed in 1998 raised the dispute in the year 2003 after a lapse of about 10 years availing all benefits without explanation of delay he is not entitle for any relief.

3. The case of the first party in brief is that he who joined the services of the second party in the year 1982 as



a Mining Worker and was rendering his services diligently and honestly in the year 1997 due to Industrial Health Hazardousness was suffered with Appendix and undergone surgery but even thereafter due to his ill health he availed sick leave from 26-02-1998 upto 30-04-1998 and even thereafter having not recovered from illness he intimated the same to the second party Manager on 2-05-1998 and the second party management without sanctioning the sick leave conducting eye wash of a preliminary enquiry for just half an hour on 19-06-1998 on the basis of the finding of the enquiry officer holding him guilty on the charges of unauthorized absence from duty w.e.f. 26-02-1998 terminated his service by order dated 12-08-1998 giving retrospective effect from 26-02-1998 and in spite of his several requests the latest by way of representation dated 31-08-2001 no action was being taken to reinstate him, he is entitle for reinstatement with continuity of service, back wages and other consequential benefits. The management in its counter statement contending that the first party since remained absent from duty unauthorisedly from 26-02-1998 despite memos issued on 12-03-1998, 18-05-1998 and 11-06-1998 to report for duty with due explanation for his unauthorized absence since failed to respond, the domestic enquiry was initiated and as the enquiry officer after due enquiry submitted his finding and the charge being proved the impugned order dated 12-08-1998 dismissing him from service w-e.f. 26-02-1998 the date from which he remained absent being passed, it is just and proper.

4. As already adverted to by me above, though the domestic enquiry is set aside holding the same as 'not fair and proper' by order dated 19th May, 2006 even after the remand by the Hon'ble High Court the second party failed to lead evidence to substantiate the charge of unauthorized absence. Only because the first party in his claim statement did not dispute having remained absent from 26-02-1998 that in itself is not sufficient to treat his absence as unauthorized absence because he has further asserted that due to the Industrial Health Hazardousness in the year 1997 he was suffering from Appendix and undergone surgery and even thereafter he continued to be suffering from ill health availed sick leave from 26-02-1998 to 30-04-1998 but the management without sanctioning the sick leave conducted a farce of enquiry and treated his absence as unauthorized and passed the impugned dismissal order. Even in the arguments addressed before me by the learned advocate appearing for the second party it was only submitted that because the date of dismissal is 12-08-1998 the dispute being raised in the year 2003 after a lapse of about 10 years he is not entitle for any relief. But with due respect to the learned advocate appearing for the second party only delay in raising the dispute cannot be a ground to substantiate the impugned action and the delay can be considered while granting other reliefs. Therefore, only because there is delay of about 5 years in getting the reference made for adjudication the reference cannot be

rejected or the impugned action of the management can be held as legal and justified. Since as already adverted to by me above, the second party having failed to lead evidence inspite of setting aside the domestic enquiry on the ground that it was not fair and proper, this being a case of no evidence only because the first party had remained absent from 26-2-1998 the action of the management dismissing him for unauthorized absence cannot be justified. However, having regard to the unexplained delay of about 5 years in raising the dispute from the date of dismissal and having regard to the nature of the job of the first party and not leading any evidence being not gainfully employed, I feel it just and appropriate to deny the back wages. Under the circumstances I pass the following award :

### AWARD

The reference is allowed holding that the action of the management of Mysore Minerals in dismissing the services of the workman Shri Thimmaiah with retrospective effect is not justified and that he is entitle for reinstatement in its service to the post he held at the time of impugned dismissal order with continuity of service and all other consequential benefits without any back wages. In case the second party failed to give him an order of reinstatement within one month from the date of publication of the award from such date the second party will be liable to pay him the wages applicable to him from the day onwards till he is actually reinstated.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 10-07-2012).

S. N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3150.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बागलकोट सीमेन्ट एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, बागलकोट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बैंगलोर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 34/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-29012/8/2011-आई आर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3150.**— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 9/2012) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Bagalkot Cement and Industries Ltd.



(Bagalkot) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2012.

[No. L-29012/8/2011-IR (M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT

“SHRAMSADAN”,

III MAIN, II CROSS, II PHASE, TUMKUR ROAD,  
YESHWANTHPUR, BANGALORE-560022.

Dated: 24th July, 2012

**Present :** SHRI S.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

**C.R.No. 09/2012**

#### IPARTY

Shri Ningappa  
Hanumanthappa Magi &  
20 Others, Navjinagar,  
Sector No. 52, Plot No. D-2,  
Navanagar, BAGALKOT

#### IIPARTY

M/s. Bagalkot Cement and  
Industries Limited,  
BAGALKOT,  
KARNATAKA STATE

#### AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred this dispute *vide* order No. L-29012/8/2011-IR(M) dated 22-02-2012 for adjudication on the following Schedule:

#### SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Bagalkot Cement & Industries Ltd., Bagalkot, in terminating the services of 21 workmen (as per list enclosed) is legal and justified? What relief the workmen are entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the reference pursuant to the notices issued both sides entered their appearance through their respective advocates. After appearance the learned advocate appearing for the first party filed a memo in respect of this very dispute they have raised the dispute in KID No. 27/2011 before the Labour Court, Bijapur and that court by order dated 03-09-2011 having held that court has got jurisdiction they do not want to prosecute this reference and may be permitted to withdraw. To this memo the learned advocate appearing for the management/second party filed his objection this reference being made exercising the power conferred under Section 10(IA) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 by the Central Government after examining the conciliation proceedings as such this proceeding cannot be permitted to be withdrawn.

3. Since as per the first party in respect of this very dispute their dispute has been entertained by the Labour Court, Bijapur in KID No. 27/2011 further passing an order

on 3-09-2011 having jurisdiction, in respect of the same dispute two adjudications cannot be made and as the first party has chosen to proceed with the dispute raised by him before the Labour Court, Bijapur he cannot be compelled to prosecute this reference. Under the circumstances this reference has to be rejected as withdrawn. Accordingly as per the memo filed by the learned advocate for the first party this reference is rejected as withdrawn.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 24th July, 2012)

S.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ. 3151.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स आरपी आयरन और माइन्स, बैल्लारी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, बैंगलोर, के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 53/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-26011/8/2005-आई आर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव।

New Delhi, the 18th September, 2012

**S.O. 3151.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 53/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Aarpee Iron Ore Mines (Bellary) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-09-2012.

[No. L-26011/8/2005-IR(M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT

“SHRAMSADAN”,

III MAIN, III CROSS, II PHASE, TUMKUR ROAD,  
YESHWANTHPUR, BANGALORE-560022

Dated: 10-8-2012

**Present :** SHRI S.N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

**C.R. No. 53/2005**

#### Ist Party

Shri Lingappa, S/o Late  
Ranappa P Opp. Patel  
High School,  
Bellary Road, Hospet,  
Karnataka, Bellary-583201

#### IInd Party

The Managing Partner,  
M/s. Aarpee Iron Ore Mines  
of Shri R. Pumpapathy,  
24/151, Bellary Road,  
Hospet, Bellary-583201

**AWARD**

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred this dispute *vide* order No. L-26011/8/2005-IR (M) dated 16-11-2005 for adjudication on the following Schedule:

**SCHEDULE**

“Whether the action of M/s Aarpee Iron Ore Mines of Shri R. Pumpapathy, Hospet, in terminating the services of Shri Lingappa, Ex- Heavy Vehicle Driver Cum-Dumper Operator without complying the provisions of ID Act, 1947 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”.

2. Shri Lingappa S/o Late Ranappa (herein after referred as first party) in his claim statement filed on 24-1-2007 claims that he who was employed as Driver-Cum-Dumper Operator in M/s Aarpee Iron Ore Mines of Shri R. Pampathy, Hospet (herein after referred as Second Party) which is engaged in mining activities, on 7-11-2002 while working underneath a Bunker (Crusher Plant) when Iron ore boulder came crashing down causing serious injury in his chest and abdomen area was immediately admitted in Kariganur Welfare Hospital and treated for two months and as the physician at Hospet who diagnosed that he was suffering from severe heart problem and later he suffered mild heart attack and costly medicines were prescribed, he made an application to the Welfare Commissioner for financial assistance and later when he approached the second party to permit him to report for duty he was not permitted to report for duty as such he approached the Iron Ore Labour Union, Bellary to help him and the said union addressed a letter to the Assistance Labour Commissioner (Central) on 23-4-2004 for his intervention and in the conciliation proceedings the second party contended that he has resigned from his service and it is not a case of termination and as the second party did not show an interest of taking him to work the conciliation ended in failure. He further alleges that since he suffered an industrial accident could not attend his duties from 7-11-2002 and after treatment when he went to report to duty the second party refused to take him on duty as such it amounts to illegal termination and that the stand of the second party that he submitted resignation is false. With these allegations he has prayed to hold his termination as not justified, unjust, illegal and void *ab initio* and directed the second party to reinstate him with full backwages, continuity of service and other consequential benefits. *Inter alia* the second party in its counter statement filed on 24-09-2007 while admitting that first party was employed as driver cum dumper operator in the year 1948 in its establishment engaged in mining activities at Hospet in Bellary District, denying the claim of the first party that he met with industrial accident on 07-11-2002 contended that as he was suffering from chest pain since

many days and with an ill motive creating a false story that mines stone hit on his chest while he was on duty filed as false police complaint before the jurisdictional police and the jurisdictional police after making detailed investigation filed 'B' report before the Addl. Civil Judge (Jr. Dn.) and JMFC Hospet, Bellary and same came to be accepted and immediately after acceptance of the said 'B' report first party approached the second party demanding for settlement of his accounts saying that he has no interest to work and on 27-01-2003 submitted a written voluntary resignation letter to the second party and while accepting the same his accounts have been settled and payment was made under voucher on 01-02-2003. It is further contended on 07-11-2002 the first party had demanded Rs. 10,000/- towards advance for his treatment and a sum of Rs. 2,500 was given as an advance towards medical expenses and thereafter submitting a resignation letter and settling his account he has come up with such a false dispute. Thus the second party prayed for dismissal of the reference.

3. When the matter came to be posted for evidence on behalf of second party while filing the affidavit of its Public Relation Officer Shri K. Basavaraj examining him on oath as MW1 got marked the letter said to have been given by the first party seeking the advance payment of Rs. 10,000 dated 07-11-2002; voucher given by the first party regarding receipt of Rs. 2500 dated 07-11-2002; letter of resignation said to have been submitted by the first party dated 27-1-2003; voucher said to have been passed regarding payment of final settlement by the first party dated 01-02-2003; self attested true copy of the medical certificate produced by the first party in the criminal case; B report submitted by the police along with the statements of witnesses recorded by the police during investigation as Ex. M1 to M6 respectively.

4. *Inter alia* the first party while filing his affidavit examining him on oath as WW1 got marked photostat copies of discharge summary issued by Labour Welfare Organization, Central Hospital, Kariganur dated 28-01-2003; certificate issued by a consulting physician of Hospet to the effect that the first party is suffering from ischemic heart disease and is taking treatment under him and is advised further investigation and a copy of the representation given by him to the welfare administrator as Ex. W1 to W3 respectively.

5. With the above pleadings and evidence lead by both sides when the learned advocates appearing for both the sides were called for arguments the learned advocate appearing for the first party just submitting that the signature appearing on the alleged resignation letter is not of the first party and that it is concocted one to cover up illegal action against the first party and urged for his reinstatement with back wages etc. *Inter- alia* the learned advocate appearing for the second party taking me through the documentary evidence produced by him urged that the

same do prove the contention taken in the counter statement and thus urged that the first party who resigned from his job and settled his claim managed to raise this false dispute claiming termination of his services, as such the same is liable to be rejected.

6. On appreciation of the pleadings, oral and documentary evidence brought on record by both sides in the light of the arguments addressed by the learned advocates I arrived at the conclusion there is no termination of the services of the first party by the second party and that he who resigned from the services and settled his claim come up with this false claim he being terminated from service and that he is not entitle for any relief for the following reasons:

### REASONS

7. The contention of the second party that the complaint filed by the first party that he met with an industrial accident after investigation was submitted with 'B' final report and same was accepted is proved by producing the copy of his complaint and 'B' summary report at Ex. M6. Further the documentary evidence produced at Ex. M1 & M2 do reveal that on 7-11-2002 the first party requested for Rs. 10,000 for his treatment and on the same day received Rs. 2,500 passing the voucher. In the letter given by him seeking financial assistance he never whisper having met with industrial accident. Further Ex. M3 said to be the resignation letter submitted by him is in his own handwriting wherein he has clearly stated that since he is not keeping well he may be relieved of his job setting the amount payable to him. On 1-02-2003 passed a voucher acknowledging receipt of Rs. 7,500 specifying it as towards full and final settlement and ex-gratia. The first party failed to demonstrate his resignation letter and voucher tendered at Ex. M3 & M4 being fabricated or concocted. He made no attempt to establish the same being concocted or forged one. Under the circumstances the claim of the first party that he had met with an industrial accident and after recovering when went to report to duty was denied job is not established, whereas, the second party proved the first party who was not keeping well vountarily submitted his resignation and received Rs. 7,500 as full and final settlement and ex-gratia. In the result I arrived at the conclusion of rejecting the reference and pass the following award:

### AWARD

The reference is rejected holding that there is no termination of services of the first party by the second party and that he having resigned volunarily and received the amount of Rs. 7,500 towards full and final settlement as well as ex-gratia he is not entitle for any relief.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 10-08-2012)

S. N. NAVALGUND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3152.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स जे. पी. कंस्ट्रक्शन प्रा. लिमिटेड, कोलकाता के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, इरनाकुलम के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 12/2012) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-9-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11011/2/2011-आई.आर. (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th September, 2012

S.O. 3152.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 12/2012) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, ERNAKULAM now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s J.P. Construction Pvt. Ltd., (Kolkata) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2012.

[No. L-11011/2/2011-IR(M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

### ANNEXURE

### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ERNAKULAM

**Present:** SHRI D. SREEVALLABHAN, B.Sc., LL.B.,  
Presiding Officer

(Monday the 25th day of July, 2012/3rd Sravanam, 1934)

### I.D. 12/2012

- Unions** :
1. The Secretary,  
Calicut Airport Workers Union (CITU),  
P.O. Calicut Airport, Karipur,  
Kerala-673 647.
  2. The Working President,  
Calicut Airport Contract Employees-  
Union (INTUC), Madeena Complex,  
Room No. 4, Calicut Airport, Kondotty,  
Malappuram, Kerala.
  3. The Vice President,  
Calicut Airport Contract General-  
Workers Union (STU), P.O. Calicut  
Airport, Karipur, Kerala-673 647.
- Management** : The General Manager,  
M/s. J.P. Construction Pvt. Ltd.,  
8/47, East Mall Road,  
Kolkatta-700 080.

This case coming up for hearing on 25-07-2012 and this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court on the same day passed the following:

### AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) Government of India, Ministry of Labour has referred this industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication as per Order No. L-11011/2/2011-IR(M) dated 03-03-2012.

#### 2. The dispute is:

“Whether the demand of contract workers employed by the contractor M/s. J.P. Construction Pvt. Ltd., Kolkata in the establishment of Air India, Air Transport Services Limited at the Karipur (Calicut) Airport Dist. Malappuram Kerala is legal and justified? What relief the workmen are entitled to?”

3. After the receipt of the reference it was numbered as I.D. 12/2012 of this Tribunal and notice was issued to all the three unions and the management. After receipt of the notice neither any of the unions nor the management has entered appearance in spite of granting several adjournments. As the unions did not appear and file any claim statement in can be held that there is no existing dispute between the unions and the management. It appears that the unions and the management are not interested to proceed with the matter. There is no meaning in keeping this case indefinitely. As the unions and the management have not turned up there cannot be any adjudication as to the dispute referred to this Tribunal and hence under the circumstances 'No Dispute Award' is passed in this case. The reference is answered accordingly.

Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and passed by me on this the 25th day of July, 2012.

D. SREEVALLABHAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3153.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स इण्डियन ऑयल कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, बरोनी, कानपुर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 28/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/24/2003-आई आर (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th September, 2012

**S.O. 3153.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government

hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 28/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, KANPUR now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. Barauni Kanpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-09-2012.

[No. L-30012/24/2003-IR(M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE SRI RAM PARKASH, HJS, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOR COURT, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute Case No. 28 of 2003

Sri Satya Narain Rai son of Late Ram Lakhan Rai,  
C/o Dr. Santosh Kumar Gupta,  
Plot No. 3268, Awas Vikas Yojna No. 3.  
Panki Road, Kalyanpur,  
Kanpur

#### Versus

The Senior Operation Manager,  
IOCL Barauni Kanpur Pipe Line,  
Subedarganj, Allahabad

### AWARD

1. Central Government MoL vide notification No. L-30012/24/2003/IRM dated 21-8-2003, has reference the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal.

2. Whether the action of the management of Indian Oil Corporation Limited in dismissing Sri Satya Narain Rai, w.e.f. 10-04-99 is justified and legal? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled.

3. Brief facts of the case are.

4. It is alleged that the complainant (since deceased) was appointed as operator E in Indian Oil Corporation Limited Barauni Kanpur Pipe Line District, Begusarai, Bihar on 07-10-67. Since his work and conduct was appreciable therefore, he was given promotion from Grade E to Grade B and then Grade C. The claimant has further alleged that he was an active member of the Trade Union, and he was ventilating the grievances of his members before the management which annoyed them. The management served with a charge sheet dated 08-10-97 on the ground of misuse of funds received by him as House Building Advance. The claimant replied the charge sheet that he has not mis-utilized the house building advance which was not accepted by the management and they decided to proceed against the employee departmentally.

5. It is also alleged that he was further issued a second charge sheet for his unauthorized absence on 21-07-98, which was denied by the claimant in his reply.



6. It is also alleged by the claimant that the management has not conducted any preliminary inquiry into the charges and the management on their whimsical grounds have appointed the inquiry officer and the presenting officer even without considering the reply of the claimant and without intimating the claimant that the reply to the charges have not been found satisfactory therefore, it has been decided by the management to investigate the charges by appointing inquiry officer and the presenting officer.

7. It is alleged that the inquiry officer has acted under pressure of the management. He did not Act independently. He has committed the breach of natural justice. The management has wrongly based on the finding of the inquiry officer and the management has terminated his services on 10-04-99.

8. Lastly it has been prayed that the dismissal order passed on 10-04-99 illegal and unjustified and is liable to be set aside and the claimant is entitled to be reinstated in the service of the management with full back wages and all consequential benefits.

9. The opposite party has filed their reply vehemently, denying the allegations of the workman. It is also pleaded by them that the claimant was served with charge sheet, he was given full opportunity of his defence by the inquiry officer and the inquiry officer after considering the evidence documentary and oral available before him on the inquiry file has submitted his inquiry report holding the delinquent employee guilty of the charge which was concurred by the disciplinary authority and as a result of the same the delinquent employee was awarded punishment of dismissal from service vide order dated 10-04-99.

10. It is stated that one of the charge against the employee was that on his request maximum amount of Rs. 4,00,000 was sanctioned to him against house building advance which was later on found that he had incurred a total sum of Rs. 3.64 lacs. The house was built on some other plot which was also not mortgaged with the management.

11. The management also issued a second charge sheet for his serious misconduct for his un-authorized absence.

12. It is also pleaded by the opposite party that the concerned workman fully participated in the inquiry and he was given adequate opportunity of his defence and thereby no rules of natural justice have been violated by the management during the conduct of the inquiry against the workman.

13. It is also the case of the management that the delinquent employee was served with the finding of the inquiry officer and the concerned employee has also submitted his submission against the inquiry report and the disciplinary authority after considering the stand of the employee has awarded the punishment which can neither be said to excessive considering the gravity of the

misconduct nor is required to be altered or interfered at the hands of the Hon'ble Tribunal.

14. Lastly on the basis of above it has been pleaded that the reference/claim of the workman is devoid of merit and deserves to be dismissed holding him that he is not entitled for any relief pursuant to the present reference order.

15. It is stated that the workman instead of availing the opportunity of filing an appeal before the competent authority has raised the present industrial dispute before the RLC which was strongly opposed by the management but the reference in the case was made without appreciating the objection of the management.

16. It is also denied by the management that the workman was victimized due to his trade union activities.

17. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties this tribunal framed a preliminary issue on the point as to whether the domestic inquiry conducted by the opposite party against the workman was fair or not. The above issue was framed vide order dated 05-08-2011.

18. After hearing arguments of the parties on the above preliminary issue and after considering the records filed by the management relating to the conduct of the inquiry this tribunal by means of a detailed order dated 23-05-12 has held that the inquiry conducted by the management is just and fair.

19. Now in view of above, it is to be seen by the tribunal especially when the inquiry conducted by the management has been held to be fair and proper, whether the punishment awarded to the workman on the basis of proved charges commensurate with the proved charges.

20. I have considered the contention of both the sides coupled with the nature of charges. I have also gone through the records filed by the management in original. After giving my anxious considerations to the records filed by the management I am of the firm view that the workman has correctly been found guilty of the charges and the nature of charges are of so grievous in nature that it could not be interfered by this tribunal under any circumstances. The punishing authority has also considered all the aspect of the matter raised by the applicant before him and I also find that had there been any truth in his submission in the contention of the workman the same could have well considered by the disciplinary authority. Moreover there is no allegation from the side of the workman that the disciplinary authority was biased against him therefore, I am also of the view that the workman has absolutely failed to prove his case regarding victimization on account of his trade union activities.

21. The management has placed reliance on a number of decisions—

1. 2005 (3) Supreme 5 Supreme Court of India page 5 in between Bharat Forzed Company Limited versus Uttam Manohar Nakatey.

In the above case it is held that the Labour Court or the industrial tribunal as the case may be, in terms of the provisions of the act, must act within the fore corner thereof. The Industrial Courts would not sit in appeal over the decision of the employer unless there exist statutory provision in this behalf. Although its jurisdiction is wide but the same must be applied in terms of the provisions of the statute and no other. If the punishment is harsh, albeit a lesser punishment may be imposed, but such an order cannot be passed on an irrational or extraneous factor and certainly not on compassionate ground.

2. 2008 (3) Supreme Today page 217 Supreme Court of India in between Usha Bruco Mazdoor Sangh versus Management of M/s. Usha Bruco and another.

In this case the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the decision of the labour court should not be based on surmises. It cannot overturn a decision of the management on ipse dixit. Its jurisdiction under section 11-A of the Act although is a wide one must be judiciously exercised.

3. 2008 Lab IC 415 SC in between M/s. L&T Komktsu Limited versus N Udai Kumar.

This ruling is on section 11-A and therein it is held by the Supreme Court that where the punishment imposed by the management was termination of service due to charge of unauthorized absence which was proved in the inquiry which was fair and proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice, then setting aside the order of termination by labour court and High Court and direct reinstatement of employee.

22. In the result it is held by the tribunal that the claimant has failed to establish his case before the tribunal and as a result of the same he is held to be not entitled for any relief as claimed by him in his claim petition.

23. Accordingly reference is answered against the workman and in favour of the management.

RAM PARKASH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ.3154.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इन्दौर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 237/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-12012/87/99-आई.आर. (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th September, 2012

**S.O. 3154.**— In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 237/99) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Indore and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20/09/2012

[No. L-12012/87/99-IR(B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/237/99

**Presiding Officer:** SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN,

The General Secretary,  
State Bank of Indore Karmchari Sangh,  
37, Bakshi Gali,  
Indore

... Workman

#### Versus

The Managing Director,  
State Bank of Indore,  
Head Office, 5, Yeshwant Niwas Road,  
Indore

... Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 28th day of August, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/87/99/IR(B-I) dated 18-6-99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in terminating the services of Shri Rajesh S/o Lalsingh Panwar w.e.f. July 96 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. The Union/workman did not appear inspite of proper notice through registered post. Lastly the then Tribunal proceeded the reference exparte against the Union/workman on 11-4-2008.

3. The management appeared and filed Written statement in the case. The case of the management, in short is that the alleged workman Shri Rajesh was never employed by the management in any branch of the Bank. There was no relationship of employer and employee between the management and the alleged workman. The provision of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (in short the Act, 1947) is not attracted. It is stated that appointment in the sub-staff cadre

is through a process of recruitment rules and the alleged workmen was never appointed through any recruitment process. On these grounds it is submitted that the reference be answered in favour of the management.

4. On the basis of the pleading of the management and reference order, the following issues are framed for adjudication—

I. Whether there is relationship of employer and employee between the management and the alleged workman? If yes, then whether the action of the management in terminating the services of Shri Rajesh is justified?

II. To what relief the workman is entitled?

#### 5. Issue No. I

To prove the case, the management has adduced oral evidence. The management witness Shri Amit Bannerjee is working as Asstt. General Manager at Area Office, Gwalior. He has supported the case of the management. He has stated at para 3 that the alleged workman had never worked in any of the branch of the Bank. This shows that there was no relationship of employer and employee between them. He has stated that he was never appointed in the service of the Bank. His evidence is unrebutted. There is no reason to disbelieve his evidence. This issue is decided in favour of the management and against the alleged workman.

#### 6. Issue No. II

On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the question of termination does not arise when he was never engaged by the Bank. It is clear that the alleged workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is accordingly answered.

7. In the result, the award is passed without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 सितम्बर, 2012

**का.आ. 3155.**— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इन्दौर के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 238/99, 239/99, 240/99, 244/99 और 305/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/88,89,90,244 और 214/99-आई.आर. (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, अनुभाग अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th September, 2012

**S.O. 3155.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 238/99, 239/99, 240/99, 244/99 & 305/99) of the Central Government Industrial tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of State Bank of Indore and their workman, received by the Central Government on 20-09-2012.

[No. L-12012/88,89,90,244 & 214/99-IR(B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

**Presiding Officer : SHRI MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN**

**Case No. CGIT/LC/R/238/99, 239/99,  
240/99, 244/99 & 305/99**

The General Secretary,

State Bank of Indore Karmchari Sangh,

37, Bakshi Gali, Indore

...Workman/Union

#### Versus

The Managing Director,

State Bank of Indore,

Head office, 5, Yeshwant Niwas Road,

Indore

...Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 30th day of August 2012

1 (a) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/88/99-IR(B-I) dated 18-6-99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in terminating the services of Shri Bheru Singh S/o Nirbhay Singh Solanki w.e.f. Sept. 97 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. (b) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/89/99-IR(B-I) dated 18-6-99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in terminating the services of Shri Prakash Chandra Chouhan w.e.f. Oct-97 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

(c) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No. L-12012/90/99-IR(B-I) dated 18-6-99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in terminating Shri Prem Narain S/o Moolchand Tiwari w.e.f Nov-97 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

(d) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-12012/244/99-IR(B-I) dated 28-6/5-7/99 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in terminating the services of Shri Radhey Shyam Yadav w.e.f. May 1995 is justified? It not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

(e) The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-12012/214/99-IR(B-I) dated 28-29/9/1999 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:—

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Indore in stopping the two annual increments in R/o Shri Akhilesh Tiwari, Peon-Farrash with cumulative effect is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

3. All the five reference cases are taken up together as all are between the same parties and with respect of common subject matter.

4. The Union/workmen did not appear in any of the reference case inspite of proper services of notice for last about ten years. Lastly all the reference proceeded exparte against the Union/workman on 29-1-2010 and in reference Case No. 244/99 on 10-6-2010.

The management appeared in all the cases but did not file any Written Statement. An application is filed by the management stating therein that the workmen were never engaged in the Bank nor was in employment of the Bank at any time. It is stated that there was no relationship of employer and employee. It is stated that the Union/workmen has not raised any dispute by filing any statement of claim for such a long time. It is stated that this shows that the workmen are not interested to content the references and no dispute award be passed.

6. Perused the records. It is clear that the Union or the workmen have not raised any dispute before the Tribunal. This shows that either there is no dispute or they are not interested in the reference cases. This shows that presently there is no dispute between the parties. Accordingly the references are answered.

7. In the result, a common no dispute award is passed in all the references without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ. 3156.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ

इन्दौर, के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जबलपुर, के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 228/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-09-2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-12012/62/98-आई.आर. (बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th September, 2012

**S.O. 3156.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 228/98) of the Cent. Govt. Indus. Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the management of State Bank of Indore and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 20-09-2012

[No. L-12012/62/98-IR(B-I)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

NO. CGIT/LC/R/228/98

**Presiding Officer:** SHRI MOHD.SHAKIR HASAN

General Secretary,  
Daily Wages Bank Employees Association,  
9, Sanwer Road,  
Ujjain

...Workman

#### Versus

Managing Director,  
State bank of Indore,  
Head Office, 5, Y.N.Road,  
Indore

...Management

#### AWARD

Passed on this 4th day of September, 2012

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Notification No.L-12012/62/98-IR(B-I) dated 15-10-98 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this tribunal:-

“Whether the management of Managing Director, State Bank of Indore in terminating the services of Shri Shailendra Parihar w.e.f. 30-6-93 and not regularizing him is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled for?”

2. The case of the Union/workman in short, is that the workman Shri Shailendra Parihar was engaged on daily wages on 20-11-84 by the management Bank, He was paid wages weekly by way of vouchers. He



worked 8 hours per day continuously and was terminated on 30-6-93 without notice and three months pay. It is stated that there is a violation of the provision of Section 25-F of the Industrial dispute Act, 1947 (in short the Act, 1947) and of Shastri Award. The principle of first come last go was also not adopted. It is also stated that after removing him, the management had engaged other daily wages employee. It is stated that the workman had worked more than 240 days. It is submitted that the workman be taken in employment in permanent service with full back wages.

3. The management appeared and filed Written Statement in the case. The case of the management, inter alia, is that the services of the workman was utilized in the Dhar Branch of the Bank as a temporary peon for the period from 20-11-84 to 16-2-85 for 75 days only. He was paid wages as had been agreed by him. The certificate given by the workman that he worked from 1-3-1985 to 30-6-93 is not genuine and is managed by the workman. He was never given any regular appointment nor he worked in the bank for more than 240 days. As such his case does not cover under the provision of the Act, 1947. It is submitted that the workman is not entitled to any relief.

4. On the basis of the pleadings of the parties the following issues are framed for adjudication :

I. Whether the action of the management in terminating the services of Shri Shailendra Parihar w.e.f. 30-6-93 is justified?

II. To what relief the workman is entitled?

5. Issue No. I

The workman has adduced oral and documentary evidence in the case. The workman Shri Shailender Parihar has supported his case in examination-in-chief. In cross-examination he has denied that he was appointed for the period of 75 days only. He has filed the said appointment letter which is marked as Exhibit W/11. The said document clearly shows that he was appointed temporary for a fixed period of 75 days from 20-11-84 to 16-2-85. He has stated that thereafter he was terminated. It is clear that the period was not extended and therefore after completion of the period the workman was terminated. The provision of Section 2(00)(bb) of the Act is applicable and he is not to be termed as retrenched employee. At para 13 he has stated that he had worked under number of Branch Managers of the Bank but there is no such pleading. It appears to be after thought. He has stated that he had not appeared in any examination.

6. The workman has filed documentary evidence in the case. Exhibit W/1 is the reference order dated 15-10-1998. Exhibit W 12 is the certificate of the work of 75 days from 20-11-84 to 16-2-85. This fact is admitted by the management in his pleading that he was engaged on temporary basis for a fixed period. Exhibit W/3 is payment statement of the

above period which is an admitted fact that he was engaged for 75 days.

7. Exhibit W/4 is the certificate dated 8-3-95. This is filed to show that the workman had worked continuously from 1-3-85 to 30-6-93. The management has challenged the genuineness of the said certificate. The workman has stated in para 14 that the said certificate was given by the cashier of the Bank on the saying by the Manager. This itself shows that the cashier was not competent to give any certificate of experience. Moreover there is nothing to show that the then Manager had told the cashier to furnish him a certificate. The said cashier is also not examined. The certificate is also contradicted by Exhibit W/8 which is also filed by the workman which shows that from 17-2-85 to 1993, he had worked only for 140 days. This itself shows that the said certificate (Exhibit W/4) appears to be not genuine and reliance cannot be placed.

8. Exhibit W/5 is the settlement dated 13-7-93 arrived between the management and the Union. This settlement is not applicable as the above discussion shows that he had not worked more than 240 days. Exhibit W/6 is the application dated 13-8-93 filed for appointment on the basis of 75 days work done from 20-11-84 to 16-2-85. Exhibit W/7 is the reply filed by the management before Labour Enforcement Officer (Central), Indore wherein the statement of work done was annexed. The said annexure clearly shows that the workman had worked only 140 days from 17-2-85 to 1993. This clearly shows that the provision of Section 25-F of the Act, 1947 is not attracted. Exhibit W/8 is regarding payment of bonus of 75 days of the period of 2-11-84 to 16-2-85. Exhibit W/9 and W/10 are with respect of work of cleaning and Hamali in the bank. There is nothing to show that it is related to the workman. Exhibit W/11 is temporary appointment of 75 days of the workman. The relevancy is already earlier discussed. Exhibit W/12 is the advertisement for recruitment in the bank who had earlier engaged 240 days in twelve months. It is clear from the above evidence that the workman had not worked 240 days by the entire engagement in the Bank. Thus the oral and documentary evidence of the workman clearly shows that he had not worked 240 days in twelve calendar months preceding the date of termination to attract the provision of Section 25-B(2) of the Act, 1947. As such the provision of Section 25-F of the Act, 1947 is not applicable. There is no specific pleading and evidence as to who had been subsequently engaged in the bank after his disengagement. There is no case of "first come last go".

9. On the other hand, the management witness Shri Suresh Chandorkar is examined in the case. He is Branch Manager at Pipli Bazar Ghat Branch of the Bank. He has supported the case of the management. He has admitted the documents of the workman which itself shows that there is no violation of the Act, 1947. Thus it is clear that the action of the management is justified. This issue is

decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

#### 10. Issue No. II

Admittedly he was engaged for 75 days. Thereafter he was engaged on daily wages. Admittedly he was not recruited through any process of appointment. This shows that there is no case of regularization. This issue is also decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

#### 11. Issue No. III

On the basis of the discussion made above, it is clear that the action of the management in terminating and in not regularizing as has been claimed by the workman is justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is, accordingly, answered.

12. In the result, the award is passed without any order to costs.

MOHD. SHAKIR HASAN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3157.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947, (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स टी.ए.एन.एम. ए.जी. सलेम के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चैन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 22/2009) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14/9/2012 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-27011/4/2008-आई.आर. (एम)]

जोहन तोपनो, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th September, 2012

**S.O. 3157.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 22/2009) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. TANMAG (Salem) and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-9-2012.

[No. L-27011/4/2008-IR (M)]

JOHAN TOPNO, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

#### TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT CHENNAI

Thursday, the 9th August, 2012

Present : A.N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 22/2009

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of TANMAG and their Workmen)

#### BETWEEN

The General Secretary : 1st Party/Petitioner  
Salem, Dharmapuri, Namakkal, Union  
Erode Mavatta  
Pokuvarathu Matrum Podhu  
Thozhilalar Sangam  
21, Vivekananda Street  
Salem-7

#### Vs.

The Managing Director : 2nd Party/  
Respondent  
TANMAG, 5/63, Omalur Road  
Jagirammalayam,  
Salem-2

#### Appearance :

For the 1st Party/Petitioner Union: Shri V. Ajoy Khosh & Porkodi, Advocates

For the 2nd Party/Management : M/s M.R. Raghavan, Advocate

#### AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour and Employment vide its Order No. L-27011/4/2008-IR(M) dated 30.01.2009 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

“Whether the management of TANMAG, Salem in paying a less salary to HMTV Drivers when compared to LMTV Drivers is justified? What relief the HMTV Drivers are entitled to?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 22/2009 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their respective counsel and filed Claim and Counter Statement as the case may be. Thereafter the Industrial Dispute stood posted for filing Claim Statement followed by Counter Statement. There has not been the representation on either side continuously for a good number of postponements of the case. Therefore, at the last the petitioner union was called absent and the Respondent also was called absent and set ex-parte.

3. Both the parties though entered appearance, thereafter continuously remained absent and thereby failed to file any Claim or Counter Statements complete with

relevant documents, list of reliance and witnesses as instructed to do so under the very reference or on the direction of this Tribunal. Therefore, there was no material before this Tribunal to find out under what support the reference is to be answered.

4. From the couching terminology in the reference, it was legitimate for this Tribunal to presume that under the Management of TANMAG there are two categories of Drivers viz. (i) HMV Drivers and (ii) LMV Drivers, that LMV Drivers are paid comparatively more salary than to HMV Drivers. The question to be considered is whether such payment of lesser salary to HMV Drivers than to LMV Drivers is justified. In this ID both the parties were absent to prosecute or defend their respective claims or defence as the case may be. Since the reference is at the instance of the petitioner, the initial burden is upon him to prove that payment of lesser salary to the HMV Drivers is justified or not. Under the Indian Evidence Act when a party wishes to make believe the Court, the existence of a certain fact it is for that party to adduce evidence to prove that. There is a maxim the meaning of which is to the effect that when both are at equal faults the condition of the defendant (herein the "Respondent") is better. There is another principle that when both sides adduce evidence the burden of proof loses its importance. So viewed, it could also mean that when both sides do not adduce evidence, the burden of proof loses its importance. In this case both sides have not even presented their pleadings or supporting documents. There is hardly any material to tilt a decision by way of answer to the reference in favour of either party. However, invoking the concept of burden of proof as being on the First Party Petitioner as mentioned above and since he has not discharged the initial burden of satisfying the Tribunal by adducing any evidence, it is only to be found that payment of less salary to HMV Drivers compared to LMV Drivers cannot be held not justified and therefore is justified in the absence of material to adopt a contra view.

5. Thus for the default of both sides an ex-parte award was passed against the petitioner as per order dated 14-07-2009.

6. As per order dated 06-05-2010 on IA 34/2010 ex-parte award was set aside and ID was restored to file. Thereafter petitioner filed Claim Statement and Respondent filed Counter Statement.

7. The averments in the Claim Statement briefly read as follows:

There are two categories of employees under the Respondent. First category employees are workmen employed in the operation and allied work in the mines and the other category of employees is staff employed in the office. First category employees are governed by conditions of service by way of settlements. Second category employees are given scales of pay and other

benefits on par with government servants leaving a disparity among them. The first category workmen employed in mining operation, though forms the backbone of the establishment their scales of pay and other benefits are less compared to the staff employed in the office. It is totally unjustified for the one and the same categories of employees, like the Drivers whose case is espoused herein. In the case of work of Drivers under any category the nature of work is one and the same with no difference. In the work carried out irrespective of the category differentiation Drivers belonging to staff category known as LMV Drivers operate only light motor vehicles like Car, Jeep, etc. Drivers under the workmen category known as HMV Drivers are operating Heavy Motor Vehicles such as Water Lorry, Explosive Van, School/Staff Bus, Dippers, Tumblers and other earth moving equipments. The second category drivers are most skilled and doing hazardous work. They are entitled to more and extra benefits than the other. But shocking reality is that they get only about 1/3rd of the salary of the other category. Even a new entrant Staff Driver gets more than the salary paid to the Drivers belonging to other category who rendered more than 20 years of service. Though there is provision for conversion and promotion of HMV Drivers to LMV Drivers after completion of 8 years of service that is not given to HMV Drivers. HMV Drivers are also asked to drive the cars and jeeps without the corresponding payment. Originally there were 30 HMV Drivers which have now been reduced to 13 due to death, retirement, etc. Similarly there was only 10 LMV Drivers which is now reduced to 4 working. Six posts in the LMV Drivers category are vacant. Instead of promoting the HMV Drivers Respondent is using Mazdoors with Driving License in their place. The 13 HMV Drivers have crossed 50 years of age. Though they belong to Skilled Grade-I their scales of pay are not equal to LMV Drivers. Again they have not been given scales of pay on par with the same category of HMV Drivers in Skilled Grade-I under other Public Sector Undertakings of Government of Tamil Nadu like TNEB, Tamil Nadu Minerals Ltd. and other comparable industries. The recognized unions did not heed to the specific grievance of HMV Drivers. Their demand for same scales of pay and other benefits to HMV Drivers on par with LMV Drivers being not considered the ID is raised which having failed the reference is caused to be made. The denial is wholly unjustified and is liable to be interfered with apart from being arbitrary, unreasonable, unjust and violative of Articles-14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution. Sub-classifying them into such two categories is without any rational nexus and is treating equals as un-equals arbitrarily and discriminatorily. In terms of added skill and hard labour while the HMV Drivers were to have been paid better they are actually deprived of equal treatment and benefits unreasonably. Not extending the same scales of pay and allowances and benefits is contrary and opposed to the doctrine of equal pay for equal work and opposed to the



provisions of Equal Remuneration Act and Article-39(d) of the Constitution. It is also opposed to principles of region-cum-industry due to denial of parity with the HMV Drivers in other Public Sector Undertakings which is again on par with the government servants. Not giving promotion to them and engaging Mazdoors in the vacancy of LMV Drivers is mala fide. Denial of corresponding pay of LMV Drivers when HMV Drivers are utilized in their places is illegal. Giving all the HMV Drivers only the same scale of pay and benefits though doing work with different skill and high skill is unjust. Hence the claim for on par treatment with LMV Drivers from date of their entry into service with arrears and all consequential benefits and also to give higher scales of pay to HMV Drivers depending upon the work and skill.

**8. Counter Statement averments briefly Read as follows:**

All the employees who were on the rolls of the private company i.e. Salem Magnesite (P) Ltd. were transferred to the second party by taking over by the Government of Tamil Nadu as per G.O.M.S. No. 41 Industries Department dated 10-1-1979. After taking over the dual categories of Drivers i.e. workman category and staff category continued. The workmen category Drivers have been receiving wages on the basis of 12(3) wage settlements since 1980. As an accepted practice of maintaining two categories of Drivers under the Respondent the same was recognized by the workmen drivers under settlements from 1-1-1980. The last settlement entered on 14-6-2007 was in force till 30-11-2011. So the workmen drivers are estopped from the claim herein made. Against the accepted practice now it is not open to the workmen drivers to demand the pay parity. The Staff Drivers also drive heavy earth moving equipments. It is not correct that workmen drivers get 1/3rd salary of Staff Drivers. It is denied that they were given promotion. With effect from 1-1-2004 grade revisions are given to them on completion of 8 years of service. It is denied that work done by both the categories are one and the same. It is denied that HMV Drivers are more skilled and do hazardous work. HMV Drivers cannot be promoted as LMV Drivers, it being not a promotional post. Demand for the same scale of pay in Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, etc. is not based on acceptable materials. Demand is not just and legal. There is no violation of Article-14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution. There is no arbitrary or discriminatory treatment. Nature of work is one and the same is denied. Equal Remuneration Act and Article-39(d) of the Constitution may not apply. Principle of region-cum-industry may not apply. Question of promotion is beyond scope of the present dispute. Wages are paid on the basis of settlement and there cannot be any discrimination in pay among Workmen Drivers. Dispute is not maintainable, it not

being espoused by majority of the workmen. Union has not been authorized to raise the dispute in a legal manner. Demand is to be dismissed.

**9. Points for consideration are:**

- (i) Whether paying a less salary to HMV Drivers compared to LMV Drivers is justified?
- (ii) To what relief the HMV Drivers are entitled?

10. Evidence consists of the oral evidence of WW1 and Ex. W1 to Ex. W20, (of which Ex. W16 to Ex. W20 are marked subject to objection of the Respondent that they are not comparable with the employment in Respondent Institution) on the petitioner's side and the oral evidence of MW1 and Ex. M1 to Ex. M23 on the Respondent's side.

**Points (i) & (ii).**

11. Heard both sides. Perused the records, documents and evidence. The arguments mainly advanced on behalf of the petitioner are that inter se both the categories of Drivers there is no difference in regard to the nature of work. The work of HMV Drivers is more risky. Both are engaged for work on rotation basis. Section (4) of Equal Remuneration Act and Article-39(d) of the Constitution mandate equal remuneration for equal work. Section-3 of the ID Act has overriding effect over contract, award or settlement. There cannot be estoppel against the statute. Demand of the workmen is justified. Being a Public Sector Undertaking under State of Tamil Nadu as a model employer the claim is to be allowed.

12. Contra arguments advanced on behalf of the Respondent are that there is classification of both categories of Drivers into workman category and staff category. Staff category Drivers are again governed by circulars issued by the Public Sector Undertaking and not by way of settlements as in the case of workman category who are absorbed employees coinciding with the taking over of the establishment from the original private owner viz. Salem Magnesite. The difference originated in 1980 and existing even now. Settlement cannot be read in piecemeal but has to be taken as a whole. For equal wages there should be an assertion that it is so on specific terms. When classification is on intelligible differentia it is reasonable classification. The equality has to be in terms of all the factors like qualification, nature of work, etc. Even after the dispute petitioner accepted subsequent wage revision as is seen from Exts. W18, 19 and 20 without objection or any reservation thereby acquiescing to the settlement. There cannot be comparison with incomparable institutions or personnel. That is the rationale behind government not standardizing pay of different Corporations.

13. Both sides placed reliance on the decisions of the Apex Court and High Courts as below.

Decision relied on behalf of the petitioner are :



- **RANDHIR SINGH VS. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS** (1982-1-SCC-618) Apex Court held "The Drivers in the Delhi Police Force perform the same functions and duties as other drivers in service of the Delhi Administration and the Central Government. If anything, by reason of their investiture with the 'powers, functions and privileges of a police officer', their duties and responsibilities are more arduous. There is, therefore, no reason for giving them a lower scale of pay than others. The argument that the drivers of the Delhi Police Force and the other drivers belong to different departments and that the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' is not a principle which the courts may recognize and act upon is unsound".
  - **SURINDER SINGH AND ANOTHER VS. THE ENGINEER-IN- CHIEF, CPWD AND OTHERS** (1986-1-LL-403) Supreme Court held "Daily wage employees of Central Public Works Department are entitled to pay and allowances on par with permanent employees -Central, State Governments and public sector undertakings should function as model employers".
  - **MACKINNON MACHENZIE AND CO. LTD. VS. AUDREY D'COSTA AND ANOTHER** (1987-1-LLJ-536) Supreme Court held "Lady Stenographers paid less remuneration than male stenographers-For deciding whether a work is similar or same in nature or another work, a broad view should be taken -Difference in details cannot defeat claim for equality -Duties actually performed should be taken into account and not those theoretically possible - Settlement between parties cannot override Act and should yield to attract sub- section 1 of Sec. 4 of the Act".
  - **FCI WORKERS UNION VS. FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA AND OTEHRS** (1990-Supp-SCC-296) Supreme Court held "Labour Law-Parity in employment -Wages-Zone-cum-same employer principle -Departmentalized labour of Food Corporation of India -Corporation directed to revise the wage structure of the departmentalized labour employed at depots in Bihar; Orissa, Assam, U.P. and Delhi regions and bring their wages at the same level as the wages of the departmentalized labour employed at Calcutta Port and the Calcutta city godowns and depots of the corporation in the State of West Bengal - Benefit of the revision should be granted w.e.f. 01-01-1974 the date from which the wages of the departmentalized labour employed at Calcutta Port were revised in 1977".
  - **HARYANA STATE ATHYAPAK SANGH AND OTHERS VS. STATE OF HARYANA** (1990-Supp.-SCC-306) Supreme Court held Service Law -Parity in employment -Equal pay for equal work-teachers of Government aided schools -Entitled to pay scales revised at par with those of Government school teachers as also additional D.A. on the basis of revised pay scales and arrears of such D.A. as found payable - Supreme Court's decision dated July 28, 1988 clarified and explained".
  - **DHIRENDRA CHAMOLI AND ANOTHER VS. STATE OF UP** (1986-11-LLJ-134) wherein Supreme Court held "Constitution of India—Art. 14—Equal pay for equal work—Employees engaged as casual worker on daily wage basis—Performing identical work as Class-IV employees of Nehru Yuvak Kendras—Employees engaged on casual basis not paid the same salary and allowances—Class-IV employees engaged on casual basis entitled to same salary and allowances like employees appointed on regular basis—Acceptance on the part of casual employees to get daily wages and not the same wages as regular employees is no answer to the constitutional guarantee under Art. 14—Appointed against sanctioned posts or otherwise does not make any difference".
- On behalf of the Respondent the following decisions have been relied on :
- **STATE OF TAMIL NADU AND ANOTHER VS. M. R. ALAGAPPAN AND ANOTHER** (1997-2-LLJ-711) wherein Supreme Court held "It is open to the State to prescribe different scales of pay for different cadres having regard to the nature of duties, responsibilities and educational qualifications—If the classification made by the State between two classes of employees is founded on rational basis having nexus with the objects to be achieved, the classification must be upheld—The principle is applicable only among equals but not among un-equals".
- STATE OF UP AND OTHERS VS. J. P. CHAURASIA AND OTHERS** (1989-1-LLJ-309) wherein Supreme Court held "The principle of equal pay for equal work has no mechanical application in every case. It has to be read into Art. 14 which permits reasonable classification founded on different basis. In service matters, merit or experience could be the proper basis for classification to promote efficiency in administration. One learns by experience as much as by other means. It cannot be denied that the quality of work done by persons of longer experience is superior to the work of a new-comer".
- HERBERTSONS LTD. VS. THE WORKMEN OF HERBERTSONS LTD. AND OTHERS** (AIR-1977-SC-322) wherein Supreme Court held "27 It is not

possible to scan the settlement in bits and pieces and hold some parts good and acceptable and others bad. Unless it can be demonstrated that the objectionable portion is such that is completely outweighs all the other advantages gained the Court will be slow to hold a settlement as unfair and unjust. The settlement has to be accepted or rejected as a whole and we are unable to reject it as a whole as unfair or unjust.”

14. I find considerable force in the case mooted on behalf of the petitioner for equal treatment in the matter of payment of salary to HMV Drivers Compared to LMV Drivers. As is admitted the two categories of employees in the category of Drivers came into being through different methods, while first category employees are workmen employed in the operation and allied work in the mines, the other category of Drivers are Office Drivers. Again while the first category of employees came to be governed by conditions of service by way of settlements, the second category of Drivers came to be given pay and benefits on par with Government servants. The first category Drivers happened to be given less pay compared to the Staff Drivers in the Office. Both categories of Drivers are doing the same nature of work without a difference. While the second category of Drivers drive only Light Motor Vehicles, the HMV Drivers operate heavy vehicles. They belong to the category of Drivers with more skill and are doing hazardous work. The HMV Drivers also drive LMV Vehicles when it is asked to do so without the corresponding enhanced payment. The denial of pay parity is arbitrary, unreasonable and unjust and further violates Articles-14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution. Their sub-classification in the manner above is without any rationale nexus and amounts to equals being treated as unequals. Actually they have had to be paid better than the other. It is opposed to the provisions of Equal Remuneration Act. According to the Respondent these two categories happened to be maintained under an accepted practice which came to be recognized by the first category Drivers under different settlements commencing from 01-01-1980 and continued in the settlement dated 14-06-2007 expired by 30-11-2011. So to say it is argued that the workmen HMV Drivers are estopped from the present claim against the accepted practice. While question of promotion is beyond the scope of the present reference, principle of Region-cum-Industry also cannot be applied to the case of the petitioner because for the same the institutions should be comparable with that of the petitioners.

15. The present concern is whether payment of less salary to HMV Drivers compared to LMV Drivers is justified? Evidently both the categories of the workmen are Drivers. There is no rationale nexus for their sub-classification into the presently obtaining two categories. For some reason, not forthcoming the classification originated even before the Company remained in the private

sector while it was taken over by the Tamil Nadu State Government, the said classification continued, the service conditions for the first category workers continued to be governed by the settlements passed from time to time and those of the second category happened to be governed by circulars issued by the Department. Evidently it is brought home that there is no rationale nexus for such a classification though the case of the Respondent is that there is rationale nexus for the classification. Again though the case of the Respondent is that nature of duty is not one and the same, without elucidation how the same type of employees/Drivers stand differentiated in terms of the duties done by them as Drivers? The fact that the HMV Drivers work in mines usually and that the LMV Drivers work as Office Drivers is not apt to demonstrate any difference with regard to the nature of the duties as Drivers. Again the further fact that the first category Drivers operate HMV and the other category Drivers operate LMV also does not constitute any difference as to the nature of work done by both. In terms of qualification that of first category Drivers is more skilled and higher. Here the classification is not shown to be on any intelligible differentia. What is in evidence is that in fact both categories of Drivers operate both types of vehicles by rotation. Even while so the first category workers are not paid the corresponding wages of LMV Drivers. This situation also strengthens the fact that both type of Drivers are doing the same work with the same nature of duty and are not at all to be differentiated or discriminated in regard to payment of their salaries. When admittedly the differentiation came into vogue by way of practice the said practice is to give way to statutory provisions like the Equal Remuneration Act and to the Constitution. The first category workmen employed in mining operation when claim to form the backbone of the establishment, the said proposition is not denied except in a bald manner. Hence that is also apt to be true. Their case of being more skilled and are doing hazardous work is also only apt to the true. Discernibly they are entitled to more and extra benefits. But instead let them receive at least parity treatment. The aforesaid decisions show that settlements cannot prevail over the statutory mandates to deny the claim of the petitioners. There cannot be estoppel against statute. On the same ratio it could well be said that despite the settlement the petitioner can estop the same in view of the overriding impact of the statutory provisions viz. Equal Remuneration Act and Article-39(d) of the Constitution. A custom or practice cannot override a statutory provision regarding the matter. The only fact is that a practice which was unreasonable from the very inception came to be questioned only at a distance of time by raising the ID at a later point of time. While the decisions relied on behalf of the petitioner are discernibly relevant for the dispute it is not so as regards the decisions relied on behalf of the Respondent.

16. On all the above consideration I am to hold that payment of less salary to HMV Drivers compared to LMV Drivers is not justified and the claim for on par treatment with LMV Drivers is legal and justified. Resultantly it is ordered that the HMV Drivers shall be given salary and other benefits on par with LMV Drivers from the date of taking over of the Company by the Government of Tamil Nadu but the payment of arrears is restricted from the date of reference.

17. The reference is answered accordingly.

(Dictated to the P.A. transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 9th August, 2012)

A.N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

#### Witnesses Examined:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner Union: WW1, Sri V.K. Chezhiyan

For the 2nd Party/Management: MW1, Sri P. Gowdhaman

#### Documents Marked:

##### On the petitioner's side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
Ex. W1	23-04-2002	Certificate of Registration of Trade Union issued to the 1st Party
Ex.W2	-	Representation given by the 1st Party Union to the 2nd Party Management
Ex.W3	27-09-2005	Representation given by the 1st Party Union to the 2nd Party Management
Ex.W4	17-08-2007	1st Party Union's representation to the 2nd Party
Ex.W5	18-09-2007	Remarks filed by the 2nd Party Management before the Assistant Commissioner of Labour (Central), Chennai
Ex.W6	16-04-2008	1st Party Union's reply to the remarks filed by the 2nd Party Management
Ex.W7	18-08-2008	Failure report
Ex.W8	30-01-2009	Order referring the dispute for adjudication to this Hon'ble Tribunal
Ex.W9	05-06-2009	1st Party Union's representation to the 2nd Party Management
Ex.W10	-	List of HMV/EME Drivers employed in the 2nd Party Management
Ex.W11	-	Copies of the Identification Cards issued to the HMV/EME Operators/ Drivers
Ex.W12	-	The pay-slips of Light Motor Vehicle Drivers of the 2nd Party Management

Ex.W13	-	The pay-slips of HMV/EME Operators/Driver of the 2nd Party/ Management
Ex.W14	-	The pay-slip of a Driver employed in NLC, Neyveli
Ex.W15	-	The pay-slip of a Driver employed in Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation, Salem

##### On the Management's side

Ex.No.	Date	Description
Ex.M1	10-01-1979	G. O. MS. No. 41
Ex.M2	18-01-1979	Letter Ms.No. 617/D1/79 from Government to 2nd Party
Ex.M3	19-04-1980	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M4	05-07-1983	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M5	19-08-1985	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M6	17-08-1987	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M7	19-10-1990	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M8	13-05-1995	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M9	25-09-1996	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M10	31-03-1998	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M11	21-09-2001	G. O. MS. No. 363
Ex.M12	16-07-2003	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M13	14-06-2007	Settlement under Section 12(3)
Ex.M14	14-06-2007	Office Order No. 182
Ex.M15	22-02-1992	Order of appointment of M. Sivaraj
Ex.M16	13-07-2010	Order of appointment of J. Jayaseelan
Ex.M17	06-10-1980	Order of appointment to C. Arumugam
Ex.M18	01-10-2010	Service Book of M. Sivaraj
Ex.M19	28-07-2010	Service Book of J. Jayaseelan
Ex.M20	10-05-2010	Service Book of C. Arumugam
Ex.M21	Sept. 2010	Pay-Slip of C. Arumugam
Ex.M22	Sept. 2010	Pay-Slip of J. Jayaseelan
Ex.M23	Feb. 2010	Pay-Slip of M. Sivaraj

नई दिल्ली, 25 सितम्बर, 2012

का.आ.3158.—राष्ट्रपति, श्री रंजन कुमार सरन को, 17-09-2012 से केंद्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक न्यायधिकरण-सह-श्रम न्यायलय, संख्या : 1, धनबाद के पीठासीन अधिकारी के रूप में 65 वर्ष की आयु पूरी होने अर्थात् 21-01-2018 तक अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, जो भी पहले हो, नियुक्त करते हैं :—

[ सं. ए-11016/05/2011-सीएलएस-II]

अजय जोशी, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th September, 2012

**S.O. 3158.**—The President is pleased to appoint Shri Ranjan Kumar Saran as Presiding Officer of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No.1 Dhanbad w.e.f. 17.09.2012 for a period upto 21-01-2018 i.e. till attaining the age of 65 years or until further orders whichever is earlier.

[No. A-11016/05/2011-CLS-II]

AJAY JOSHI, Under Secy.